EX LIBRIS
252.478
G915
SOCIETATIS
VERBI DIVINI
Techny, Ill.

The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

SERMONS AND LECTURES

Nihil Obstat:

F. THOS. BERGH, O.S.B.

Imprimatur:

EDM: CANONICUS SURMONT,

Vicarius Generalis.

WESTMONASTERII,

Die 14 *Martii*, 1910.

Sermons and Lectures

BY

MONSIGNOR GROSCH

RECTOR OF ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST'S,
ISLINGTON, LONDON

The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

FATHERS' LIBRARY
TECHNY, ILL.

WITHDRAWN

NEW YORK, CINCINNATI, CHICAGO
BENZIGER BROTHERS

PRINTERS TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE | PUBLISHERS OF BENZIGER'S MAGAZINE

5.111

RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BRUNSWICK STREET, STAMFORD STREET, S.E.,
AND BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

FOREWORD

THE discourses forming this volume were prepared without even a remote intention that they should have any permanency, beyond that which might find place with those to whom they were actually addressed by word of mouth. In yielding to the suggestion to publish them, which came from, perhaps, too kind friends, the Author had to overcome a very strong reluctance, arising from a twofold consideration. Books of sermons and discourses are already very numerous; originality of matter, or even novelty in the manner of treating it, is almost impossible of attainment. As to originality, it would be idle to attempt it. With the great sermons of the Fathers of the Church, and those of modern preachers and writers at hand, it would be more than difficult to produce anything which has not been treated, and treated most admirably, by them. Their works are a mine of wealth for the preacher and writer, and in these discourses they have been freely used. If, however, there be little of originality in matter, the hope may not be altogether groundless, that the method of treatment may render these discourses useful. "The Spirit breathes where He will," and so even this humble effort may be the means of bringing light and life by His grace, producing effects which bear no proportion to its merits.

H. J. G.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Religion and the Child	1
Religion in Youth and Age	14
Religion and Home Life	22
Religion in the Market-place	30
Religion in the Light of Eternity	38
Divided Allegiance	47
Catholic Intolerance	60
Modern Idolatry	72
Religion on Principle	84
The Church of Christ, Catholic	97
Unity of the Church of Christ	120
The Church's Authority	137
Catholic Worship of Saints and Angels	160
The Mother of Learning	180
For the Liberties of Holy Church	219
St. Peter and England	232
Ireland's Apostle	242

PAGE

THE SOLDIER SAINT 252

"A LOVER OF HIS BRETHREN" 265

A TRUE REFORMER 276

MARTYRS OF ENGLAND 288

OUR LEPER BRETHREN 299

PEACE AND WAR 308

A HEROINE OF THE CRIMEA 317

RELIGION AND THE CHILD

(Westminster Cathedral)

One of the characteristics of a living language is that the meanings of its words are liable to modification and change. Words are but the expression of ideas, and as ideas are, in a sense, capable of an almost infinite variety, and words to express them are limited, words which once expressed a certain definite thing are made to include very much more than they originally did. We have many examples in our own tongue. Words which in Shakespeare's time expressed one idea are now used to express quite different, and sometimes opposite, ideas. In this way the word religion has been extended in meaning, until it covers much more than would have been understood by, let us say, the Jews of old, by the early Christians, or even by our own ancestors of a few hundred years ago. Which of these would have

thought of religion as it is thought of at the present day by a large number of people? Would religion, as it is understood by some to-day, have provided a motive for the sacrifice of all that they held dear in life, nay, even of life itself, rather than abandon it? If religion to them had been but sets of opinions, or the observance of exterior formalities, or adherence to certain men or to human societies for human motives and for human ends, would religion have been able to inspire them with such courage, such fortitude, such love, as enabled them to account all things lost if they lost that, and all things gained, whatsoever else was lost, if they saved that? No; their religion was something noble and ennobling, differing from the empty and soul-destroying shams which are often paraded in our day as religion, as light differs from darkness, as truth differs from falsehood.

Faith was the foundation of their religion; supernatural faith, not opinion, not conventionality, not outward show, not hypocrisy, not hero-worship. Faith, which is something very real, very positive, very fixed. Faith must be the foundation of religion; and faith must be its sustaining power. It is necessary to say at least this much about

religion in general, before entering upon the consideration of its relations to some of the more important matters connected with our daily lives, and of its relation to what has been called the most important matter of our life, namely, our death. Unless we grasp the fundamental truth that God is the End towards which our religion is directed, that it means, theoretically, the science of man's relations with his Maker, and, practically, the discharge of the obligations which the knowledge of them entails, we shall arrive at no very definite or useful conclusions.

Every creature is bound to God by the very fact of creation. A relationship arose as soon as it could be said that there was a Creator and a creature. The relationship differed in character, according to the nature of the creature. It necessitated a worship, and the nature of the worship varied, in accordance with the gifts and powers received by the creature. As the nature and destiny of the creature rose in excellence, so must the character of the worship rise in proportion and perfection. Man, therefore, must worship God according to his intellectual and moral nature, which distinguishes him in the order of creation.

Religion for him must be the understanding of God, according to the limits of his capacity to understand. He must know God, and that knowledge of God includes a knowledge of his obligations towards Him. These obligations include obedience and service, of such a character as is consonant with his nature, as a reasonable being, endowed with free will. As a learned writer has said, "Religion is the conformity of man's mind to God's mind by right thinking, and of man's hand to God's law by right acting." When man knows God's mind, he knows truth, and he must assent to it. When man knows God's will he must bring his will into conformity with it. The will of God in regard to man is that he should obey the moral law, in accordance with God's command. This is religion: the worship of God the Creator with mind and heart, and service; the worship of the intelligence and of the will, offered in the manner which God has made known to His creature, capable of knowing and of desiring.

It seems necessary to insist on these elementary truths, to understand correctly the attitude of the Catholic Church with regard to the place of religion in child training. Nothing but the true

conception of what religion is, as the Catholic Church teaches it, could account for her uncompromising stand in demanding its place, foremost and all-important, in the training and teaching of her children. If it were something about which there was a choice; if it were temporal and passing; if its absence meant only the loss of something which could be compensated for; she would never place herself in irreconcilable antagonism to any attempts to remove it from the training of those committed to her charge. Because she realises the meaning of the words of her Divine Founder, that it profits a man nothing if he gain the whole world and suffers the loss of his own soul, she never ceases to require that, whatever else they may be deprived of, this priceless treasure must be secured to her children; that they may learn to know God, and to serve Him, in order to attain the end for which they were created, namely, the salvation of their souls, by His true and proper worship, made known to them in theory by the teaching of the Catholic Church, and practised by them, according to her ordinances.

In England we have been paying vast sums of money for the education of the people, yet we find

thousands utterly uninstructed, and undeveloped in their souls, in their hearts, and in their intellects. They have been to school, but we discover among them, characters which remind us of those periods of revolt and revolution, when some of the best blood of Europe was sacrificed to the savage vengeance of the haters of all authority and all religion.

For forty years education has been compulsory in the land. We have thousands of buildings testifying to the opportunities offered for secular education. The greatest possible care is given to physical training; we must sustain and develop the physique of the nation; the higher studies in the arts and sciences have been encouraged; scholarships have opened the way to University careers; all things admirable in themselves, and yet, something is wrong. Is it that the training of the children has been divorced, in greater or less degree, from the only thing which can prevent such training being a source of danger; from religion? A cry is heard at the present moment in the country for a purely secular system, doing away with religion as a part of child training altogether. As well do away with oxygen in the air and imagine you

are going to sustain life. Religion is the oxygen of the moral life.

But, perhaps, it might be argued that the doing away with religious education in the public schools would not destroy the religious training of the children. This could be carried on in the homes, in churches and chapels. Such an argument scarcely calls for refutation. Religion must proceed step for step with the whole of the child's training. The school is the daily life of the child, the school is the atmosphere in which it mostly lives—that atmosphere must be religious. The knowledge of God, of the duties to Him and to our fellow men, which are consequent on that knowledge, must have the first place in the training of the child. Reason tells us that those powers or faculties of man which are in him for the development of his soul must be stirred up, brought out and exercised, if he is to reach the end for which alone a soul with such powers could be destined. It will live, it is true, without such development, but it will not live a life according with its faculties. These faculties will be not only wasted, but, demanding development, they will seek it outside truth and goodness, the natural objects of the

intelligence and the will, and find it in falsehood and in evil. No! the spiritual part of the child's being must be trained from the beginning; religion must be the predominant and determining factor in the moulding of a child's character.

If a child is taught that the whole end of life is prosperity, success, comfort, material advance, what influence is brought to restrain when these things are sought after at the cost of truth, and justice, and honour? Some will answer "Moral restraint," but, as has been truly and wisely said, "Morals and religion are but different aspects of the same idea, and of the same human need," so if moral restraint, then religious restraint, for there is no true and lasting moral restraint which is divorced from religion. Then we hear the assertion, that secular things can be taught apart from any reference to God. Can history, science, philosophy be taught without reference to God? Can true wisdom, can cause and effect, can science be taught apart from the All-wise, the First Cause, the Truth Eternal? Will you teach the child the alphabet and leave out the letter A? Will you teach the child figures and begin with the figure 2? Will there not be an inquiry about the figure 1, so

soon as the idea of 2 takes hold of the child's mind? But you could more easily teach the alphabet without A and figures without 1, than you could teach history or philosophy without God. These human things must refer back to God, the fountain of all truth, the cause of all certainty.

But we may go further. Those who would have a system of education without religion, do not know in practice what the word education means. Every faculty must be brought out, every power of the soul. Pour knowledge into his intellect, train the mind to think, but leave the heart alone, leave aside the strengthening of the will power, and the subduing of passions, and you will have a monster. Imagine a child of five or six years old, whose physical growth has proceeded normally up to that age. Stay the growth except as to one part, for instance the head. A physical monster is the result; not, however, such a monster as the development of the intellect without the development of the affections and the will would produce, for then the result is a moral monster.

Knowledge is power. But all power requires restraint. Keep your horse in hand with bit and bridle, or its power may mean destruction to you

and to it. Take away the controlling hand of the chauffeur from your motor, let power be unrestrained, disaster must follow. When you have given the child knowledge, you have given him power; if that power is to be influenced for good, controlled, restrained, it must be by religion.

Many who are not Catholics would agree with us thus far, but they cannot understand why we are not content to have some general kind of religious training for children, without anything definite. Indeed we are accused of narrow-mindedness. Why not be a little more reasonable, and let all children be educated in a common Christianity? Leave aside any denominational teaching. Why not be content with broad Christian teaching, and leave your Catholic dogmas alone? Ah! poor word Christian! You have been another victim of change. If Christian teaching meant now what it meant a few hundred years ago in this country, we should be quite content. Christian teaching and Catholic teaching were synonymous terms; a Christian was a Catholic, a Catholic was a Christian. The meaning of the word has changed, and if some of the Christians of a few hundred years ago could visit the land

of their birth, and witness what is accepted as Christianity by some of the people of this country, they would wonder if Christianity were the word by which the religion of Christ Jesus had been known in their day.

What, however, is this undenominational teaching? If we take an oath in a court of justice, we are required to swear that we will tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; no partial truth, nor truth mixed with falsehood or error. Similarly, we insist that the child must be trained in the truths of religion, in the whole truth, and in nothing but the truth. It requires no demonstration to show that there is no teaching of Christianity, except that taught by the Catholic Church which secures this, and therefore we require such teaching for our Catholic children. We want complete teaching, which is impossible in any mutilated or truncated form of Christianity. But what a fallacy to imagine that there can be a common platform of Christianity! How far can we go together? Catholics and Protestants both believe in the existence of God. But so does the uneducated savage, if he has exercised his reason. The next great truth of Christianity is the divinity

of Jesus Christ. There are those, however, who would object to be excluded from the platform of a common Christianity, although they do not believe in the divine nature of Jesus Christ. After the very first point of agreement upon the existence of God, it becomes next to impossible to find a common platform of Christianity.

Probably a Catholic priest would be accused of narrow-mindedness were he to say that undenominational education is a popular imposture. Some might even consider such words due to his priestcraft and sacerdotalism. This, however, was the definition given of it by a distinguished statesman [1] who could never be accused of bias in favour of the Catholic Church.

Perhaps we have delayed too long on a subject of which so much has been heard of late years in this country. It is necessary, however, that the

[1] This was Mr. Gladstone. A statesman of another school of politics has quite lately added his testimony: "The idea of trying to meet the religious needs of the country by setting to work to devise what is called 'non-dogmatic teaching,' is surely the wildest dream imaginable. . . . I do not care what it is about, all teaching that is worth anything is dogmatic teaching. . . . You teach them (the children) arithmetic, and you must teach them dogmatically. . . . If you do not teach them dogmatically, you cannot teach them at all."—Mr. BALFOUR, March 1911.

Catholic principle should be repeated again and again, until we ourselves are familiar with it, and until others outside our body recognise the reasonableness and the fairness of it.

The Catholic Church, in demanding and in endeavouring to secure a true religious training for her children, is the greatest friend of humanity, the greatest benefactress of the human race. The tender and docile years of childhood are those in which the future life of a people must be laid. Lay the foundation of a future life for the children of this land upon the rock bed of religion; train them in mind and in heart to be true to God, true to their fellow men, and true to themselves; then they shall be more worthy citizens of the earth, in proportion as they are trained in the highest, and noblest, and most glorious of all sciences, the science which teaches of God; and in the sweetest and dearest of all services, the service of God our Lord and Master.

RELIGION IN YOUTH AND AGE

(*Westminster Cathedral*)

The transition from childhood to youth is rapid. It is that period of life when one has ceased to be a child, and has not yet become a man, or a woman. For most people, as a rule, the period of youth has many charms. Some consider it a time when, most of all, interest and help are called for from outside, and some may think that, generally speaking, it is not understood, nor sympathised with, nor helped in its undoubted necessities, as it might be, perhaps because its peculiar trials and needs are lost sight of in the endeavour to assist childhood and old age. All will agree, however, that it is a period of vast importance, when, perhaps more than at any other time, religion, with its directing and restraining influences, is required, while at the same time it is more difficult to practise.

Youth is a time of wonderful experiences. The panorama of life is opening, ideals are beginning

to form themselves, influences are beginning to work. There are hopes and aspirations, recognition of the beautiful, the mere fact of existence, and with all these come the stern realities of life. In youth, springing up among normal good surroundings, there is a buoyancy and a brightness which gives no indication of possible depression and shadow. Trust and confidence live for a time, until something reveals the hollowness of the world and its deceit. Disillusion comes speedily, the hard fact is forced home that all is not good, all is not true, things are not always what they seem, friends are discovered to be false, trust has perhaps led to betrayal. The struggle has begun, how is it going to end? Conscience says, "Stand by truth," but falsehood seems, at times, to be more convenient. "Be just," says conscience, but the opposite seems often to be more profitable. "Be clean, be good," but those who are neither, seem to have what is called a good time. "Serve your God," but how many millions serve Him not, and yet are, apparently, as well off as those who do, and sometimes better!

Poor youth! what difficult problems to solve! "What shall I do? Why should I not go with

the tide?" are the questions arising in the youthful mind. When this tumult is raging, when nature and present satisfaction are strongly inclined to that which is of earth, is there not a voice needed to cry out unceasingly to the youthful heart, "Earth is not all, earth is not all"? What voice but that of religion can do this? True religion, namely, that founded on faith. Faith rises up, and mystery, though much remains, mysteries are cleared up; life is faced bravely, because faith teaches that to suffer is to reign, and that that which is good and true is preferable to all things. What a mighty influence is required when nature, hitherto calm and unruffled, is stirred by the storms of passion, not to one vice alone, but to many: to pride, self-sufficiency, excess. Youth is eager to hurry on; religion calls a halt in the world's rush for the discharge of duty to God the supreme Lord. Religion stands between youth and the precipice.

True religion brings the soul into communication with God. It disciplines the soul in the duties of its relationship with its Creator. The restraining influence of the religion of Jesus Christ, which is the religion of self-denial and cross-carrying, must be brought into practical exercise.

There must be the healing and bracing powers of the Sacrament of Penance, the spiritualising powers of the Holy Communion, with its transforming influence for youth which can make him say with St. Paul, "I live now, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." In thousands of lives the influence of religion has come in the time of youth, it has held the helm, and guided it safely through the troubled waters to the desired haven. In many thousands of lives of which we know nothing, in some of which we know a little, religion has framed and fashioned and led to deeds of heroic sanctity and suffering, a Pancras, an Agnes, an Aloysius, a Stanislaus.

Youth without religion! Our Lord has drawn us a vivid picture of it, in the story of the Prodigal Son. The youth, in whom religion is growing weak, feels the holy restraint of his father's house, he pines for freedom, which is bondage, for liberty, which is licence. If he be well-to-do, plenty of company is at hand; debasing men and designing women are ready to pounce upon youth, whether man or maiden, to devour their substance and to destroy their souls.

There are some who talk nonsense about the

necessity of youth having its fling, "sowing its wild oats"—it is generally sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind. Often such conduct leads to temporal destruction, followed by eternal perdition. But when the time of riot is over, when necessity succeeds to plenty, when the bloom and beauty of youth have been driven away by excess and indulgence, do erstwhile boon companions help to bear the shame, and share the sorrow? No, the poor youth is left to suffer alone the pangs of regret, remorse and disgrace; few are found to reach out a helping hand to the fallen. There is, however, still one power, one only that is really effective, the power of religion, to raise and to rectify, to encourage and to restore; and happy is that fallen youth if a religious foundation gives him the foothold which will enable him to rise up and go to his Father. Repentance is not the same as innocence, yet it is the next best thing, and our good and gracious Master has been pleased to show it His special and most indulgent favour.

Catholic youth must learn to lay value on its privileges. Youth is swift to fly. It is a time of riches, however, in which to lay up provision for the winter of old age. It is very sweet in its too-short day, very dear in its memories, very loving

towards those whose kindly smile and approving word help it when, perchance, its sun is for a moment clouded. If those whose youth is now no more than a recollection, will remember this for those who are still in its golden day, they will exercise a charity which must be pleasing to Him who looked upon youth and loved it.

If youth stands in need of the help of religion, not less does age, especially advanced age, when the snows of many winters have gathered round the head, and life is no longer a prospect but a retrospect. Youth has gone; and middle age, time and labour and sorrow, have left their mark upon the physical form, and the soul stands in special need of some power which shall enable it to bear the ever-increasing feebleness of the body. It has special needs. Disillusion has succeeded disillusion, until most of the poetry which made life possible has been reduced to severe prose. Friends are remembered rather than known, scenes that were brightest have lost most of their charm. Infirmities have produced a good deal of impatience, selfishness has grown unperceived, concentration upon self has resulted in indifference to the trials of others. Disappointments and much ingratitude have blunted the feelings and soured the disposi-

tion. Children, first the joy of life, then its anxiety, and perhaps, at last, its constant grief—children whose mature strength was looked forward to as the prop of old age have become a crushing and painful weight on its shoulders. Perhaps the poor soul is wearied with struggle, so often necessary, so seldom victorious; even a sensible approaching towards the unseen does not strengthen the power of faith. Old age might well be the period of despair, were it not for the help and comfort of religion. Forces are renewed by a constant inflow of grace, prayer may become more possible and more frequent, by reason of the feebleness of body for physical labours. Religion softens, sweetens and sustains. The calm "God's will be done" which comes to religious old age has a sanctifying power all its own. Confidence, founded upon the fidelity and the generosity of God, comes with increasing years to a life influenced by religion. Nature, which is asserting her power and claiming her penalty, is not allowed to dominate, but is made to submit to the higher powers of grace. Fear, which is scarcely separable from age, is so blended with filial devotion that it becomes a confidence without

presumption, bringing about a throwing of all our care on Him who has a care of us; because we are afraid of Him we throw ourselves into His bosom.

O blessed and unequalled power of religion! As the Catholic Church can show among her canonised saints, a brilliant array of youths distinguished to the degree of heroism in that sanctity which is part of her being, so is she rich in her array of venerable men and women whose age has been sanctified by religion. Martyrs and pontiffs, matrons and virgins and holy widows, bishops and priests and cloistered monk and nun, king and peasant, learned and simple, by use of the means of holiness which she was founded to supply, have made of old age a very temple of worship wherein to give glory to the God of eternal years. So may it be with us when old age is our portion. If youth is still with us, let religion send up the fragrant incense of its reasonable service before the throne of our God, Who is always the self-same and Whose years do not fail.

"Young men and maidens, bless ye the Lord; let the old with the younger praise the name of the Lord, for His name alone is exalted."

RELIGION AND HOME LIFE

(Westminster Cathedral)

THERE is an approved method followed in dealing with physical ills, which we should do well to adopt in our endeavour to combat social and moral evils. It is the method of discovering the cause and removing it, or applying the remedy. Palliatives are useful for the moment; they ease the pain, but they do not touch the cause of the disease. Discover the cause, and if there be a remedy apply it, and await the result with confidence. Only an accident will prevent it.

No one would be so foolish as to expect perfection in anything, when human agents are the workers, but it is generally agreed that there is much more wrong with both individuals and with society than there need be or should be. There are those who declare that the evils of the present day are in excess of any which have been prevalent in Christian times, and that there is much in

the lives of modern Christians which would surprise the unchastened heathen, and give him cause to believe that his excesses were highly respectable in comparison. To denounce and to deplore are necessary to rouse attention to the fact; to find the cause and to apply the remedy are essential for the removal of the disease. None would be so bold as to declare that all the social evils of the present day arise from the wrong estimate of, and the falling off from, the Christian ideal of the family life, but it is doubtful if there is any which cannot be traced, either directly or indirectly, to the decay of religion in the family life, that state originated by God himself and meant by Him to carry out His designs with regard to the human race. Probably by far the greatest number of moral evils at present scourging society have their cause in the decay of religion in family life, and certainly the only remedy is the restoration of family life to that condition which even nature demands, and for which religion abundantly provides.

Man and woman were created by God to be to each other a help and a companion. They were to cleave to each other, to supply each other's wants,

to cherish and to sustain each other. Woman's gentle, patient and enduring love was to sustain man in the battle of life, and his fidelity and strong protection were to be a part of her reward. They were to be a mutual aid to each other on the path of their eternal destiny, they were to walk hand in hand to heaven, by their companionship making each other's salvation easier and more certain. Their lives were to blend and harmonise with each other, they were to bear one another's burdens and so fulfil the law of God. Now if this was to be their duty to each other, apart from any further consideration, is it not evident that religion should be a directing force when the choice of a life companion is made? If so much for eternity depends on the choice, should only temporal considerations be weighed in the selection? Certain proprieties and customs with regard to position, and suitable provision and suitability of age are to be observed certainly, but marriages in which human and temporal considerations are the motives, and from which religion was excluded in the beginning, may possibly be happy for here and hereafter, but it is not in the nature of things that they should be. So far this is considering only one part of God's

design in instituting the married state, namely, that of husband and wife to each other, but when we come to reflect upon that added and sublime mission, whereby the designs of God with regard to the human race are to be carried out, we realise the greatness of the responsibility.

Children may be committed to their keeping, to be absolutely dependent upon them, at least during the most precious years of their lives. Not only are their bodies to be fed and clothed, but their souls are to be trained, and their characters to be formed; they are to be prepared, physically and spiritually, to go out into the world, to become, in their turn, heads of Christian families and Christian homes. This is the noble mission of Christian parents, one full of dignity and grandeur, but one requiring gifts and graces quite beyond the natural powers of man, but possible, and even easy, with the supernatural power of grace.

The Divine Founder of the Christian religion elevated a natural to a supernatural state. He sanctified the marriage contract and raised it to the dignity of a sacrament; by nature inviolable, He added to it the further inviolability of religion, and consecration. So sacred, so holy is this union

of consecrated nature, that it is not unworthy of being compared with that ineffable union which exists between Christ and His Spouse the Church. If marriage is so often a failure, may not the cause be the absence of religion in its very inception? Even among Catholics, is there not some danger of the standard being lowered, and the holy state of matrimony being regarded solely as a social condition apart from supernatural ends, which may be reached by supernatural means? Even if, in the early days of married life, human love sustains for a while, is it going to last long without religion? Do not the difficulties of husband and wife increase, rather than diminish, by time? There arise the natural responsibilities of a family, and unless religion is there to direct, there is a tendency on the part of parents to shirk those responsibilities, and to hand them over to others. Mothers without religion prefer themselves and their comfort, to their duty and their privilege, and fathers shirk the inevitable duties of their state, and lose sight of the purpose of God's gifts to them.

Religion, which would keep before them their duty to God, which has its extension in their duty to the family of which they are the heads—religion

must be the salt of the married life, or it will not only lose its savour, but the peace and stability of human society will be in danger, and human happiness will become impossible. It would, perhaps, be difficult to exaggerate the value of religion in the struggles, which few are exempt from, arising from little misunderstandings, trivial faults, impatience, selfishness, and the many shortcomings which do not decrease with increasing years, and which our presumption upon the good nature of those who are nearest to us, often makes us guilty of towards them. Can anything but true religion insure the humility and forbearance which arise from the knowledge of our personal guiltiness before God, and which provide us with the honest courage to own that we are not without fault, and with the generosity to grant to others that forgiveness which we hope will be extended to ourselves? Sometimes, thank God, we witness the effect of religion in lives united in the most sacred bond which mortals can know in this life. The sanctifying power of daily prayer; the strengthening effect of the sacrament of penance; the uniting in most perfect life, by frequent reception of the Holy Eucharist, of two lives pledged to each other;

this can make one understand the saying that marriages are made in heaven.

The family life does not consist only of the union of father and mother, and of their duties to their children. Parental authority, obedience of children, and mutual love of brethren, are the three primary laws upon which Christian family life must rest. Unless religion governs, there will be, as there often is, indications of a rebellious and contemptuous spirit against parental authority, which is as destructive of family life as it is opposed to the order of nature itself. The very fact that nature has thrown the infant into the arms of the mother, in helplessness and dependence, is an indication of this. We do not need the express command of God to honour our father and our mother: such a duty is indicated to us by our conscience as soon as the relationship is understood. Yet there is evidence of a general revolt against parental authority at the present time. It is not confined to one section or class. It is found among the aristocracy, the middle, and the labouring classes. We have heard, perhaps, of the young noble blood who, arguing in debate for freedom from parental authority, gravely said, "Of course,

gentlemen, we admit that our parents are our fellow creatures!" Gracious concession! It argues the absence of religion, and is one of the most dangerous signs of the times.

The youth of England must understand that much of her distinctive character comes to her from a long tradition of domestic virtues, and these are only sustained by due reverence on the part of the sons and daughters of England to their parents. Next to the sanctuary, there is no holier place than the home, and its sanctity is sustained by religious reverence. The safest method to insure obedience and respect in the youth of the future, is for the youth of the present to discharge the duties they owe to those who, by God's ordinance, are placed over them in parental authority.

RELIGION IN THE MARKET-PLACE

(Westminster Cathedral)

"*And judgment is turned away backward, and justice hath stood afar off, because truth hath fallen in the street . . . and truth hath been forgotten.*"—ISAIAH lix. 14, 15.

THESE are the words of the prophet Isaiah spoken when God said to him, "Cry, cease not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show my people their wicked doings, and the house of Jacob their sins." God's people were being kept from Him by the sin of injustice. Truth had been forgotten, and so justice had stood afar off. We may not know, we can only conjecture, how great at that time the displeasure of God must have been, to call forth so strong a command; but we may believe that His command would be not less strong now, in this land, and in these times, if His voice could be heard, in condemnation of injustice.

However we may endeavour to hide it from ourselves—and our personal and national pride causes us to hide many things from ourselves

which it would be useful for us to acknowledge—it is a fact, which needs less light to see than it does courage to admit, that we are becoming, as a people, more and more unblushingly dishonest. Justice is standing afar off, from many of us. The eternal principles of justice are being forgotten, and their practice disregarded, and the reason is because religion has ceased so largely to be the guide of life, "truth has fallen in the street, truth has been forgotten."

Our most deeply rooted evil passion is, perhaps, selfishness. It begins with us earliest; it remains with us persistently; it is the last to leave us, if it ever does. It is difficult to admit it, for its admission means violence to that which we love best and are least disposed to wound, namely, self. Honest reflection for a moment will force us to admit that self always claims first attention, even in trivial and insignificant matters. How strong, when in the presence of others, is the desire to assert self. Let another contradict us and we resent this attack on our self-love. Self-love has been wounded. Does not the same motive prompt us to seek prominence among our equals, and perhaps even among our superiors, because love

of self cries out, and says, "The first and the best for me"? Or again, let something be proposed which is to benefit another, as well as ourselves, how keen we are to secure that we are placed at no disadvantage, how little thought we have for the benefit of the other! Must we not acknowledge, that we insist on preference for self even in small matters? When matters of great, perhaps of supreme, importance arise, touching justice to our fellow man but necessitating suppression of self on our part, are we likely to do violence to self in such circumstances, when we are unwilling to do so in matters of small importance? Is this our nature, or our practice? No; self seeks to be paramount, self demands supremacy, and will stand at nothing, not even at base injustice to our fellow man, in order to secure it. Truly justice hath stood afar off, because truth hath been forgotten.

Truth is religion, and religion is that virtue which binds us in duty, not to God only, but also to our fellow man. Duty to our fellow man means, if it means anything at all, the practice of the eternal principles of justice in our dealings with him. The first great principle and command with regard to our duty to God and to our fellow

man, was given of old on Mount Sinai by the Lord God of Israel, and it was traced on tables of stone for an eternal remembrance. When in the fulness of time God became Man, He decreed that all who should be His disciples, in deed and in truth, should have, as a distinguishing and necessary characteristic, that love for God and for man which is summed up in the command "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind, and with thy whole strength, and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." But there can be no real love where there is no justice, and justice, as the truth spoken of by Isaiah, has fallen in the street, because truth has been forgotten.

Go out into the world of business and look for the fair form of Truth; she is driven from the Market-place, and Justice is hurled from her throne by the selfishness and dishonesty of men. In public and commercial life injustice is rampant and unashamed. The late Lord Russell of Killowen, a man of measured and deliberate word, with vast and varied experience, declared a few years before his death that the commercial system of modern times is rotten to the core. Bare-faced cheating

abounds, and is called business. To do good business often means to do injustice and injury to others. Thousands upon thousands of the relatively poor, the widow, the orphan, have been ruined in building and other societies by the greed of unprincipled men. Bogus companies are formed nearly every day, and nearly every day they smash, but every one does not lose. Directors issue specious reports; treasurers issue falsified accounts; balance sheets, which have no balance except on paper, are sent forth, to delude and to entrap the simple and the unwary. Bribery and corruption are found in the administration of public moneys, in tenders and contracts, in parliamentary elections, in public appointments. Stocks and shares are dealt with in ways that are more than questionable; some call it business, others manipulation. It seems not to affect a man's reputation if he manipulates unjustly. He must not, however, bring discredit on the market; he must not be found out. So long as he meets the demands of his fellow brokers, and avoids the disgrace of being hammered, it matters little how many small investors he ruins. The principle often acted on is "Get your living—honestly if you can, but,

anyhow, get it." There is no word to be said against that large body of men who, by lawful transactions and honest dealing with those who are quite capable of taking care of themselves, make large profits by legitimate means. Those only are referred to who, in defiance of the law "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you," get possession of their neighbour's property, to which they have no right or claim. They call it clever, sharp, smart; but judged by the eternal principles of religion and justice, it is cheating. It is unjust, it is sinful, it cries aloud for reparation and restitution. The Catholic faith and its practice, in this, as in all else, is a tremendous safeguard.

Every Catholic knows, by the teaching of his religion, that there are two effects which arise from injustice towards his fellow man: the necessity of repentance and humble confession of the crime, and the restoration to the injured of that of which he has been unjustly deprived. There is no absolution for the man who is not prepared to place the injured one in as good a position as he was before being made the victim of selfishness and of greed. How wholesome for the correction

of our natural inclinations towards evil are these practical tests to the sincerity of our religious professions. The Catholic Church, built upon the rock of divine truth, must ever be the exponent, the champion, the enforcer if need be, of justice. Her children are held within the narrow limits of the laws of justice by her teaching and by her practice, and happy are they who conform to both. No one would say that those who are not Catholics are wanting in their sense of justice or their practice of it. Our good fortune is to know many outside the Catholic Church, who are models of uprightness and integrity. Neither could any one assert that Catholics are universally honest. Alas! experience sometimes proves the contrary. What, however, may be affirmed is, that the Catholic religion, with its insistence upon the theory and the practice of the divine and eternal law of justice, is the one remedy for the dread disease which is eating, like a canker, into the very vitals of commercial life, turning the Market-place of the world into a place of pestilence and corruption. The remedy is to be found in the restoration of truth.

Restore truth to the place which the God of truth

intended it to occupy. Let the teaching of the Catholic Church prevail, in principle and in practice, and Justice shall reign, and her reign shall be glorious, because it shall be in very deed the reign of religion and of truth.

RELIGION IN THE LIGHT OF ETERNITY

(Westminster Cathedral)

"*And I saw a great white throne, and one sitting upon it, from whose face the earth and heaven fled away, and there was no place found for them. And I saw the dead, great and small, standing in the presence of the throne, and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged by those things which were written in the books, according to their works.*"—APOCALYPSE XX. 11, 12.

"HOLY, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, Who was, Who is, and Who is to come. . . . The Lamb that was slain is worthy to receive power and divinity, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and benediction. . . . To Him that sitteth on the throne, and to the Lamb, benediction and honour and glory and power for ever and ever. And the four living creatures said: Amen. And the four-and-twenty ancients fell down on their faces: and adored Him that liveth for ever and ever. . . . And they cried with a loud voice, saying: Salvation to our God, who sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb. And all the

angels stood round about the throne, and the ancients, and the four living creatures; and they fell down before the throne upon their faces, and adored God, saying: Amen, Benediction, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, honour, and power, and strength to our God, for ever and ever. Amen." Even these few words gathered from the canticle of praise and adoration which St. John heard poured forth by the four living creatures and the four-and-twenty ancients, who surrounded the great white throne in the kingdom of God's glory, seem to lift us up from the earth. Sublime, however, as they are, they fall short of the ineffable joy which must fill the beings of the heavenly Jerusalem, and cause them to cast down their crowns before the Lamb. Flooded with light from the light uncreated, their intelligences are capable of realising something of the length, the height, and the depth of the knowledge of God, which surpasseth all understanding. His beauty, His wisdom, His power, His glory fill them with joy. Their cries are but the expression of the unspeakable delight which ravishes them, and compels every faculty of their being to break out into songs of praise and thanksgiving. Surely as

we listen to this echo from eternity, where the bond of celestial religion binds the glorified irrevocably to God, our poor human hearts feel a longing desire to attain the apparently unattainable, and to join voices with them, in praise and thanks to our God, Who sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb. O, when shall we be freed from the prison of this flesh, when shall we stand before the living God?

We have considered some of the relations which exist, or which should exist, between us, as creatures of God, and God, our Creator. We saw that from the earliest moments of our existence, even before we were capable of being conscious of it, the fact of our existence bound us to God. Then when reason dawned, and will began to act, our faculties stood in need of training in the science of God. Happy were we if a religious education brought out those powers and trained them towards Him, in knowledge and love and service. We were being directed towards our eternal destiny; religion was the guide to our feet, and the light of our way. When youth and strength were filling us with joy, we understood the power of religion to make us discriminate between real and

false happiness, and we gave of our best to Him Who had given us all. Old age found us faithful; helped and encouraged by religion in our many afflictions, we fixed our eyes still more stedfastly upon our eternal hope; in weakness, we felt its strength; in sorrow, its joy was our comfort; in the shadow of death, religion shed forth her light upon us, and we went forth in trust and confidence. Religion had made the burden of our exile more tolerable; the happiness of a religious home and a religious family life, were a foretaste of the joy of our eternal home under the roof of God our gracious Father; and justice had governed our relations with our fellow man, as we dealt with him in the Market-place. We owed no man anything but to love one another. Such was the reward of religion, even here in the state of our striving.

We looked also at the other side of the picture. We saw the disaster of a life lived apart from God and from religion, producing intellectual monsters, with faculties developed only towards knowledge which can never satisfy; which materialises and debases the noblest gifts of our nature; which turns the will only towards the perishable and the destroying, and centres the desires of the heart in ignoble and

degrading excess. We saw lives destroyed by the corruption of an irreligious youth. When youth's fleeting joys were over, when false happiness had fled like a phantom, where could youth turn, if it had not religion, except to greater excess, to find what the human heart is always seeking, real happiness? Old age became despair unless solaced by religion. Riches might be heaped up by the unjust and the unscrupulous, but happiness was not found. Uncertainties and anxieties were the daily lot of those whom the world esteems happy; struggles after place and renown brought no immunity from sorrows, sickness or disease. Disgrace and reproach fasten on the children of fortune and embitter their lives, when religion, the one unfailing treasure, the one real honour, the only sovereign remedy for all the ills of life, is absent.

Yet is there any real mystery about it? Experience teaches us the impossibility of happiness in any of those things so keenly sought, so eagerly desired. But supposing our experience could have been otherwise, has the one truth which we can trust, given us any reason to believe that all the world can offer will bring abiding happiness, apart

from religion? The rich man has heaped up wealth; he has trampled on every law, divine and human, to attain his end; the cries of the wronged have risen to heaven for vengeance on him; every comfort of life is his, yet is he happy? No; for "blessed"—or really happy, on the word of divine truth—"blessed are the poor in spirit." Pleasures are poured like a torrent into the life of the pleasure-seeking man, he has basked in the sunshine of the world's favour, his life has had apparently no touch of sorrow in it, and with all this, is he happy? No; for "blessed"—on the word of truth—"blessed are they that mourn." Fame has come, and has raised a man above his fellows, the world has resounded with the name of the great ruler, the great conqueror, the great discoverer. Thousands have praised his deeds, and he sits on a pinnacle of pride. But is he really happy? Again no; for the same truth has declared, "blessed are the meek." Ah! but for one there is surely happiness. Delights of every kind have been his. No desire has been denied. He has plunged headlong into voluptuousness, his senses have had complete satisfaction, licentiousness has filled his life, and is he happy? No; a

thousand times no; for "blessed are the clean of heart" is the declaration of divine truth. And yet how many are seeking their happiness in these ways! How appalling in the sight of God must be this departure of His creatures from the pursuit of real happiness. What must be the result? Listen to St. John again. "And I beheld, and heard the voice of one eagle flying through the midst of heaven, saying with a loud voice: Woe, woe, woe, be to the inhabitants of the earth." Malediction to those who were without religion; to those who have not the sign of God on their foreheads; to those whose worship has been given to devils, and to idols of gold and silver, and stone and wood, which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk. Woe to them for their murders, and for their iniquities, and for their thefts, woe, woe, to the world without religion.

Compare the lot of those against whom these awful pronouncements of woe were uttered, with the happiness of the blessed beings who, round the great white throne, were proclaiming the glory of God and His blessedness for ever. They are bound to God by the gentle ties of love and service, religion is their bond of union; the others had

denied that service and had served God's enemy and themselves. Brethren, which lot shall be ours?

Is it presumption of us to imagine ourselves among the throng standing before the throne? Perhaps even in this life we have sometimes known the blessedness of God's nearness to us. Our privileges as Catholics have made God's presence, even here on earth, a very living and a very close reality. Perhaps we have known Him in the beauty of innocence, when He seemed to walk with us in a very Garden of Eden. If not, perhaps we have felt His blessed presence near to us in the moments of His bountiful forgiveness. Most happy of all if in the joy of Holy Communion we have folded Him to our bosom in the Sacrament of His love. Ah! surely, we sometimes felt that the Lord was nigh, and for the moment earth ceased to be for us, and heaven was within us. Too soon were we reminded that we were still in exile, and that these joys were as drops of water in the desert. What shall it be to possess Him in abiding fulness! Even the inspired writers had to despair of conveying any idea of the bliss and glory of heaven. "Eye hath not seen, and ear hath not heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man

to conceive the joys which God has laid up for those that love Him."

There in the City of the Blessed, we shall be in His eternal sunshine. "And the city hath no need of the sun nor of the moon to shine on it, for the glory of God hath enlightened it, and the Lamb is the lamp thereof, . . . and the gates thereof shall not be closed nor shut by day, for there shall be no night there . . . there shall not enter into it anything defiled . . . but they that are written in the book of life of the Lamb."

"Praise the Lord, O Jerusalem, praise thy God, O Sion, because He hath strengthened the bolts of thy gates, and hath placed peace in thy borders."

O, the happiness of an eternity, the perfection and the reward of religion! Shall such an eternity be ours? It shall through God's mercy, if, setting aside the things of earth, we seek those that are above, in humble, constant, generous service of God, the service of true religion. "My soul hath thirsted after the strong living God: when shall I come and appear before the face of my God?" Our thirst for God, arising from the ardour of our religion, shall be satiated by the eternal living waters, at the fount whence they spring.

DIVIDED ALLEGIANCE

(St. John's, Duncan Terrace, Islington)

It would be impossible perhaps, to find any one who does not admire that principle or quality which we understand by the word allegiance. It seems to involve the principle of justice, and however far a man may be removed in practice from its observance, so long as reason remains, justice in itself is admired and approved. Allegiance does not signify anything which would entitle its observers to be accounted saints or heroes, any more than the man who pays his rent and his bills looks forward on that account to the honours of canonisation, or expects to be remembered for all time by a grateful and admiring country.

Allegiance is an act of justice; something is received, something is owing in return. It is the debt of the recipient to the giver. It is the tie which binds the subject to his lord, by reason of the protection, or other benefits, which the lord

extends to his subjects. It was well understood in the old feudal times, when each one had his liege lord, to whom service was due for benefits received. We understand very well what is meant by allegiance to our country and to our Sovereign, and we feel that it involves honour as well as justice. It is not mere gratitude, though gratitude will raise its quality and intensity. All subjects of a kingdom are bound, in justice and honour, to loyalty or allegiance to that kingdom, because it is their kingdom, whose bosom feeds them, whose strength protects them. If our country were at just war with another, allegiance would demand that our first thoughts should be for her. Sacrifices called for by patriotism would be made willingly, and so much as a thought of the enemy, which involved a dividing of our allegiance, would be accounted a crime.

What is true of the duty owed by us to a temporal sovereign and to an earthly kingdom is true, in a higher and fuller sense, of our duty to God, our Lord and sovereign Master, and to the kingdom of Jesus Christ. These, according to the profession of our belief, claim of us, with most perfect right, an absolute and complete allegiance.

So far as theory goes, there are none calling themselves Christians who would deny this. Alas! there are few who in practice make their deeds square with their profession. Another kingdom steps in and makes its claim, and service to this latter brings with it so many apparent benefits, that its opposition to the kingdom of God is lost sight of, or if not, a compromise is attempted, which, on the word of God, He will never accept. Yet there are many who affect to arrange such a compromise. They hardly let themselves know it; they would not wish to be considered otherwise than as true and loyal Christians, undivided in their allegiance. But to be a Christian is to accept Christ and all His teachings, not as mere speculative truths, but as practical factors in the regulating and ordering of our lives. It is to submit to Him, intellect and heart and will. It is to become, not in this matter or in that, but in everything, so far as it can be known to us, the subject and the servant of the One Master. It means a subjection of the intellect to a Teacher Who is divine; and while often in words this submission is made, when the test is applied, allegiance is found to be divided between the Lord God

and human judgment. This poor created being will set up a standard, according to which he will judge what he shall accept as truth, and what he shall reject. That standard is our intelligence, which, according to its very nature, is incapable of understanding all that the uncreated Wisdom may make known to it. Undivided allegiance, that is, unquestioning reception of, and complete intellectual submission to, God's revealed word, so soon as it is known, is of the very essence of Christian faith. No one can be a Christian who does not acknowledge the right of God's truth to bring into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ. But this is just the very thing that many calling themselves Christians refuse to accept.

"No," they say, "I owe a duty to myself, to the great gift of intelligence which God has given me, and I refuse to be bound to believe that which I cannot understand." Where, then, is their boasted allegiance to God? It goes so far as they wish, and no further. It is allegiance only in name; there is no system of religion outside the Catholic Church which even supposes this absolute submission, or complete intellectual allegiance

to God's revelation. Whether they be what are called Nonconformists, of any shade, or Protestants of any of the various degrees between so far honest, if wicked, old Protestantism (which declares the Catholic Church to be the Scarlet Woman of the Apocalypse; the Pope Antichrist; and Jesuits devils incarnate) and the highest of high Anglicans (who pray for the Pope as Vicar of Christ, while they refuse to obey him), one and all, tacitly if not openly, in practice, if not in theory, divide the allegiance due to God, between Him and their own private judgment.

But supposing the submission of the intellect is complete, that is not sufficient. It is possible for the will and the heart to stand out in rebellion. Conviction may be absolute, submission of will does not always follow. If the will is not in accord with the understanding, the whole being is not giving allegiance, and God demands the whole being. Why do we see Christianity so largely smitten with palsy and unfruitfulness? Because, while there is plenty of outward and formal adherence to its principles, real, consistent, practical fidelity is comparatively rare. And why is it so? Because it is hard to discipline the heart. Our

own selfishness comes in, our greed, our impatience of restraint. If only we could be Christians, and merit the rewards promised to, and hoped for, by Christians, and not be under such restraint here, how convenient it would be! But Christianity means a service, and service means a submission, and submission means a denial of self. Then, the world round about it is so lenient, so nice to get on with, so comfortably easy in its laws of justice and morality. How easy it appears to serve it, and how well one gets on, if one does. There seems no reason why some understanding cannot be arrived at, by which we may conform, for the time being, to the world and give it our allegiance, and at the same time look forward to a happy hereafter when the world shall be able no more to demand our service.

With sentiments such as these many quieten their consciences, serve the world and themselves, and delude themselves with the fancy that they are still serving God. Is this not strikingly like the Pharisees who were denounced as hypocrites? Did not they conform exteriorly to the laws of their religion, and were they not sufficiently hard upon those who did not? And yet what of themselves? They were

whited sepulchres, denounced as such by Christ Himself. Theirs was a divided allegiance. Is there any of it to be found to-day? Plenty. It is not difficult to find the man who lifts his hat to God with one hand, and picks his neighbour's pocket with the other. Ostentatious attendance at Church on Sunday is often made to atone for one week of fraud, and to remove suspicions for another. Have we not known in our time those who preached and prayed, and were held in confidence and esteem, robbing the widow and the orphan? Have we not known them parade their pretended allegiance to God, that they might gain the confidence of the unwary and the trusting, only to rob them of their little store, and leave them in want and ruin?

To such depths as these it is not likely, perhaps, that any of us have fallen, but such depths are possible, and they are not reached at once. They have their beginnings. Even those who have sunk to them began to fall while still respecting the virtue of justice and honesty, and deceived themselves into calling by a mild name that which deserved a strong one. Call a base thing by a fair name, and it seems to lose

more than half its baseness. The world, like ourselves, does not relish plain words, if they are disagreeable. Its susceptibilities are so fine, that it prefers to call dishonesty by the harmless and honourable name of business. "That was good business." "I was able to do a little bit of business over that," very often means that justice was absent from the transaction. Sometimes business is spoken of as being "shady" when it is nothing else than a downright fraud. "Shady" is a nice soft word. We hear of somebody being "squared," and in our innocence we wonder what mechanical process was used to effect such a change, and we find that that some one has been bought or bribed to keep silence, when the law of God and of justice demands that he should speak. A "smart" man often means one who can defraud successfully, that is, not be found out. There are plenty who have only one model in the Holy Scriptures which they imitate or admire, and that is the unjust steward. He cheated his master by writing off a portion of the sums due to him, with the prospect of sharing afterwards. "How much do you owe my lord?" "One hundred barrels of oil." "Here, sit down quickly and write off fifty

per cent., and be ready to do a turn for me when I want it." And there are those who account the unjust steward a smart man of business, when he is guilty of sheer dishonesty. How low has the estimate of virtue fallen! What has become of allegiance to the God of Justice, when it can be declared, as it was lately before the Commission of the Chamber of Commerce, that it was impossible to do business and to be honest at the same time! Perhaps impossible was too strong a word to use, but one does know with certain knowledge, that business men find it extremely difficult to be successful if they are strictly just in all their dealings. Not that the dealings, in themselves, would not admit of a fair legitimate gain, but that certain more than questionable methods, which are called customs, must be observed, or some one must suffer.

There seems to be no doubt that a large system of corrupt secret commissions is in vogue, a system which has been truly declared to undermine the security which one man ought to feel in dealing with his fellow man, and which causes "misery to those who have been brought up to abhor everything dishonest, yet who find themselves in an

atmosphere where they are practically compelled to avail themselves of the custom." As a Lord Chief Justice of England has said, there are those who "find themselves tied hand and foot to this wretched and corrupt system." How can a system of this kind do anything else but bring about that moral corruption "which blunts the sense of honour and honesty"? Often in the beginning conscience pricks, but one is told that it does not do to be too particular, one would never get on in the world, and "you must live, you know," which often means you must be dishonest or you will never get on. And the price of getting on is the sacrifice of principle, and the dividing of our allegiance. Is it worth it? Perhaps you may say, "this does not affect us." Well, it may not actually and directly, but it may indirectly, and virtually. There is so much of it going on all around us, that it is easy to lose the sense of the injustice involved. We may even condone it, and say that it must be so. We want to be considered liberal. I do not mean liberal in politics, but liberal in the wide sense of broad-mindedness, not bigoted, not too particular, ready to stretch a point, even though the stretching be away from the standard of justice

and the allegiance we owe to our God. None but men of uncompromising rectitude can steer safely through all the dangers of a professional, commercial, or business life, and the beginnings of any deviation from the straight course of honesty and justice is a danger which cannot too soon be realised. There is one thing which is eternally true. As there is nothing which can make essential wrong to be essential right, so there is nothing which, by calling it custom, can make that to be honest which is of itself dishonest. No; there can be no compact between injustice and the loyal servant of God; our allegiance to Him forbids it, for He is a just God.

Political matters are, in themselves, foreign to the work of a Catholic preacher, and find no place in a Catholic pulpit. But we know that politics and parties may easily be a cause of divided allegiance. No one could reasonably condemn party politics; it seems to be the system agreed upon, and so far as one may know, to work well upon the whole. But should the question arise, as to which is to be preferred, a party which, as a body, is ready to enforce something which our faith or our allegiance to God must condemn, and a

party which is prepared to defend our religious rights, there is no choice of action for us. Party and prospects and politics must go, before we may swerve one inch from our attitude of loyalty to our God and to our Church. It is not an unknown thing that a great political party should be hostile to the Church. They have been in the past, they may be again, and it becomes every loyal Catholic to hold himself so that God and his faith are the first factors in his life, and the objects of his obedient loyalty; and then, if he choose, and in subordination to these, politics and parties may find place. There have been those who have tried a compromise, and who have failed, on one side, and on the other. No, there is no compromise possible between God and the world. He can never forego the supreme and absolute claim which He has on our allegiance and on our service. Look at the man who has made himself a slave of the world, though he knows that the only happiness is to be found in the service of God. Is he a success? He has tried to combine the two, and has failed in both. Timid and depressed, he looks out and sees the course he ought to go, and he dare not, for the world would think he was

shaking off his allegiance to it. He goes through life without ever having known the glorious liberty of faith, and at the same time is a failure from the world's point of view; a victim of divided allegiance.

Ah! brethren, the day shall come when we shall know how false, how vain, how illusory are all those things which tend to divide our allegiance. When the world and all that claims us here is falling from our failing grasp, and we, with trembling soul, are feeling the near presence of the Eternal, how shall we lift up our heads in blessed hope, as we remember that our allegiance has been to God alone, and we know that even now the King is claiming His own.

CATHOLIC INTOLERANCE

(St. John's, Duncan Terrace, Islington)

WHAT an unpleasant sound the word intolerance has to an Englishman's ears! It seems to be associated with all sorts of disagreeable and hateful ideas, and to be opposed, almost as much as slavery, to our national love of liberty and fair play. This is so, perhaps, because it is customary to use the word almost exclusively in a sense which is truly hateful, as an equivalent to persecution. Indeed we may find this given as a synonym in the dictionary; and in this sense we would reprobate it as strongly as any one could wish. With very little reflection, however, we may see that there are senses in which we are all intolerant. If a man says that black is white, or that two and two make five, we may pity him as an imbecile, but we do not say, "My good sir, you may be quite right, perhaps it is so, your opinion is quite as good as mine, and you are quite as sane as those people

who say that black is black and cannot be white under the came conditions, and that two and two, so long as we are agreed upon the meaning of the words, must invariably make four." No, we are intolerant, and we expect every one else to be so, in these circumstances. We are intolerant of burglars and pick-pockets, and nobody accuses us of anything dishonourable, or unmanly, if we hand over this sort of people to the police. The law is intolerant of violation, and we do not say that a judge is a monster of intolerance, when he sentences a criminal to a term of imprisonment in the exercise of his duty. This much, just to show that all intolerance is not, necessarily, the hateful thing that is generally supposed. The word may have a good meaning; it may even be a virtue. Everything which is founded upon law, whether it be natural or supernatural, human or divine law, must be fixed and stable and intolerant of deviation from it. Consider the natural law of gravitation. Is there any ultimate deviation from this, possible? The effects of the law may be temporarily overcome, but the law remains, and so soon as the obstacle or resisting power is removed, gravitation will assert its law. You may build up what theories you

please, but do not attempt to build a house beyond the deviation from the perpendicular which the law of gravitation will allow, without some corrective influence, or you will find your house tumbling down about your ears. The law of gravity as far as we can know is universal, and it will show how intolerant it is, if you attempt to violate its laws.

As law is intolerant of violation, so is truth intolerant of error. Error is opposed to truth and destroys its very idea, and no one dreams of denying it, except there be question of error in the matter of religion. Then, strangely enough, all appears to be changed. There seems to be a law of common-sense governing most men in ordinary matters of life, but when religion is under consideration, common-sense runs riot. Such a thing as religious intolerance, it is said, must always be wrong. Whatever happens in other matters of truth, let every man think as he likes in religious ones; it is a matter of free choice, quite as much as the cut or the colour of the clothes we wear. Let the spirit of kindness and universal brotherhood prevail, as made known to us in the Gospels, and let us leave to the Catholic Church the narrow-

minded, bigoted, intolerant position which she assumes of alone having the whole truth, and alone being the true religion. This would be, I think, the attitude of many millions of our fellow countrymen to-day, who speak of Catholic intolerance, and assume that it is all that their imaginations have painted it; which is as far removed from the reality as truth is from falsehood. It is true that the Catholic Church claims to be the embodiment of the only one true Christianity. She says practically, there is but one true religion, one true faith, and that all who wish to save their souls must embrace that belief, unless they are prevented from doing so by something beyond their control. And it may as well be admitted at once that she is the only Church which does so. The only one which practically does not say, "Perhaps you will do quite as well outside my pale as within it," the only one which says, identifying herself, as she has a right to do, with her Divine Founder, as He identified Himself with her, "I am the way, the truth, and the life." If this is intolerance, the Catholic Church must plead guilty to it, for this is, and must be, the essential characteristic of the religion, which claims to be the messenger to man-

kind of the whole and unfailing truth of God, revealed to her through Jesus Christ, and through the indwelling and operation of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth.

In truth there is a legitimate intolerance, and it was in the very nature of a new revelation from God, that it should not be left to man to accept it, or not, according to his will. If he would be a follower or a disciple of the Divine Teacher of mankind, then the whole message must be accepted with unquestioning mind. Do we not find this to have been the principle of that Divine Teacher Himself? They must accept His teaching, or they must go. Did He ever accommodate His doctrines to suit the whims or prejudices of His hearers? He had come to draw all men to Himself and He yearned after the soul of every human being, yet He could not tolerate as His disciples those who received not His word. Go back for a moment to that wonderful scene in the desert, when He was teaching the necessity of the reception of the heavenly food which He should give them. "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, you shall not have life in you." Many of His disciples objected to this part of His

teaching, and they walked no more with Him. Now if He had been tolerant, He would have called them back and said, "I am sorry you cannot agree with this part of My doctrine, but you do accept some of it, go not away; it would be intolerance to oblige you to accept that which you do not like." But He saw them go, and though it meant for them, perhaps, the loss of their eternal souls, He could not, and He did not prevent them, because He could not change His divine truth. He would not even allow human affection and human duty to interfere with the service which He demanded. Could anything appear to be more reasonable than that a man should desire, before obeying the call of Christ to follow Him, to discharge the pious and filial duty of burying his father? Yet, when one whom He called said to Him, "Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father," Christ said to him, "Follow Me, and let the dead bury their dead." A certain one was called and he said, "I will follow Thee, Lord, but let me first take leave of them that are at my house," and the Lord indicated to him that such a request was incompatible with the divine call.

The line of conduct which He pursued Him-

self, He prescribed, with even greater strictness, for His disciples. "Whosoever," He said to them, "shall not receive you, nor hear your words, going forth out of that house or city, shake off the dust from your feet. Amen I say to you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment, than for that city." For the rejection of His doctrine, made known by their word, there was to be no toleration. Even in matters which would appear to affect only civil or social life, there was to be no toleration of disobedience to the Church's authority. Suppose an offence was committed by one brother against another, and private efforts to correct and conciliate were fruitless, then action was to be taken which should bring the offence under the official notice of the Church. "Tell the Church. And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee, as the heathen and the publican." Could anything be more uncompromising, more intolerant, and yet more necessary, and more just? In the discharge of the Apostolic ministry, the first preachers of the Gospel made no secret of their methods. God had charged them with the delivery of the message of truth; no mitigation of it could be made, for any

individual or for any nation. Those who made dissensions were to be avoided, they were not to be allowed to continue in communication with the faithful. Heresies would arise, but they were not to be tolerated, those who held them were to have no part with those who held the truth. What St. Paul had preached was the truth; it was one, as truth must ever be, and though an angel from heaven should preach a Gospel to them besides that which St. Paul had delivered, they were not to tolerate, not to listen to, but to reprobate, nay, to accurse, any who should thus attempt to undermine the edifice of divine truth.

What the Apostles did and taught in their days, as the first ministers of Christ, they did with the sanction and authority of their divine Master. What they were, that Church must be which continues their mission. She must be intolerant of error, or she would be an unfaithful transmitter of the word of truth. What age has been without its heresies? What would be the condition of Christian truth to-day, but for the inflexible attitude of the Catholic Church towards innovators and destroyers? Would the primary and essential truth of the divinity of Jesus Christ have with-

stood the onslaught of Arianism, if the Church had been tolerant of error? We can see the effects of this so-called tolerance with regard to religious truth in our own country to-day. These countless sects, all calling themselves Christian, though contradicting each other in vital points, are all the fruits of a tolerance which Christ Himself and His Apostles would have rejected and condemned. No; the "pillar and ground of truth" can never tolerate the destroying presence of error.

It is not within my province or intention to touch, except most briefly, upon the assertion that the Church must be accused of unjust intolerance in the past, because she may have sanctioned the employment of physical means to maintain the purity of her doctrine. It is a great question, and one which requires a calm and dispassionate mind to examine. One or two facts, however, must always be present to those who would rightly understand the Church's attitude and action. Almost invariably, innovators in doctrine were disturbers of the civil peace; they were offenders against the secular, as well as against the religious power. Their doctrines were subversive of the laws of the State. Often rapine and plunder and gross im-

morality followed upon their teaching. They were a public danger. Moreover, no secular or physical force was ever used against them until all other means had failed. The Church has always loved the souls of her children and desired their salvation, though she has hated and condemned their errors. Again, to understand the question, one must try to transport oneself to those times, when things were not regarded in the same light as they are now. If a thief steals one's money now, he is justly sent to jail, but if he robs a man of his faith, the law does not pursue him. It was not always so. Times were, when a man's or a people's faith, was accounted their highest treasure, and he who threatened its peaceful possession was a public criminal, and this all teachers of heresies did, and so they brought themselves within the arm of the law. But this much must be said before dismissing the subject. The Church has never interfered with any man's opinion, however heretical, so long as he did not publicly declare it, and thus become a danger to others as well as to himself, a danger to the eternal interest of the souls committed to her keeping.

And now a word with regard to the restrictions

which the Church puts upon her own children, restrictions which by some of those outside her are looked upon as intolerance, and a denial of freedom. She is not only the teacher of the Christian world, she is the Mother and guide of all Christians. Plainly then, her duties are those of a good Mother. She is intolerant of poison to the minds of her children, as the good mother is of poison to her children's bodies. She is discharging one of her most sacred duties when she lays her hand upon pernicious literature, and forbids her children to touch it. She insists upon her children having the written Word of God pure and unadulterated; she is intolerant of human caprice exercising itself upon the work of God. She is intolerant of the breach of any part of the Gospel morality, and so she declares with the Holy Ghost, that "what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." She is intolerant of divorce. The sanctity of the married state, its indissolubility, she recognises as the foundation of family and social life. Kingdoms may go, whole nations may leave the fold of Christ, but that uncatholic, unchristian principle of divorce, as it is generally understood, she never can, and she never will tolerate.

In what has been said, and in much more that could be said, what do we find that the charge of intolerance against the Catholic Church amounts to? Simply to this. That she has been, through God's mercy and protection, according to the promise of her Founder, the divinely guided preserver and teacher of God's truth and the uncompromising champion of the morality of the whole Gospel of Jesus Christ. A glorious mission, a noble and sublime achievement! Where, outside of her, do we find this seal of heavenly origin, where this unfailing likeness to the eternal, unchangeable Truth? Where this unflinching assertion of the binding force of the moral law of the Gospel, in the face of a cold, critical, and hostile world? And why do we find it in her? Because the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, Who founded her, and poured into her treasury the infinite merits of His redeeming blood, is with her; and in Him, and through Him, and by Him, she is the way, the truth and the life.

MODERN IDOLATRY

(St. John's, Duncan Terrace, Islington)

"*Neither be ye idolaters, as some of them were, as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.*"—1 Cor. x. 7.

We might wonder why St. Paul should address these words to people who had already given up idols and had become Christians. They were addressed to his converts at Corinth, who had joyfully received the message of the Gospel truth from his own lips, who had come to the knowledge of the truth of God, and who were, presumably, followers of Jesus Christ. A little reflection, however, will make the reason plain. They were Christians, it is true, but they were the few among the many, and the many were idolaters. Every day, in politics, in business, and in social life, this little flock of Christ was thrown among those to whom the God of the Christians was still the unknown God. They were in the minority, and it always requires extra strength of will and of

character to maintain a position or a line of conduct which is not popular. It is always so much easier to go with the stream than to force one's way against it. Nature leans towards that which is easiest, and that is easiest which requires least self-restraint, which gives more freedom. So the little band of new Christians required to be warned against even the appearance of approving of the false worship, or idolatry, which was practised by those round about them. It might seem to them, perhaps, of small importance whether or not they partook of meats which had been offered to idols. It made the foods neither better nor worse in themselves, but St. Paul saw in it the beginnings of danger. There was the possibility that done by them, these acts might be interpreted as approval or as willing tolerance of idolatry, and so he warned them against it. He calls to their remembrance the idolatry committed by God's other chosen people after they had known the true God, and after He had delivered them from the bondage of Pharaoh. Moses, their leader, was on the mountain with God, receiving from Him the tables of the law, in which God's supreme and absolute dominion over them and over all things is declared,

and adoration of Him, and of Him alone, is commanded. They, forgetful of their strong helper, demanded a God whom they could see. The old spirit of their heathen masters was upon them, and Aaron set up the golden calf. They made an altar and offered holocausts, "and the people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play."

But, perhaps, it may be asked, of what concern is all this to us? One can understand St. Paul warning the Corinthians. They were only just come out of idolatry. Their conditions were exceptional; the warning of the Scripture is not meant for us of to-day, because, as a matter of fact, idolatry is only to be found in heathen or uncivilised nations. There are many who would be prepared to argue thus. If one went up to the man in the street and asked him whether there is such a thing as idolatry in this country, one might get for an answer: "Well no; we are most of us Christians and not idolaters, unless it be the Roman Catholics, and I have heard that they are. They worship the Virgin and the Pope, they bow down before pictures and statues, crosses and crucifixes. They burn incense and sprinkle holy water, and do a lot of other things, all idolatry

every bit of it, but except these and, perhaps, a few people who are called rather 'high,' there is no idolatry here; we are all Christians."

Such an idea of modern idolatry we need not go far to find. It is, unfortunately, very common amongst the ignorant, and it is not unknown amongst some others, whose place in the world of letters, whose university distinctions and official positions, would seem to preclude the possibility of their taking anything on trust without investigation, especially if it were to the detriment of their neighbours' character and good sense. Such charges of idolatry against the Catholic Church, however, are not modern. They have been made since the beginning, they will continue to be made, and they will always find dupes to believe them. It is not my purpose to refute them now. It is not necessary. It would be almost a waste of time, and certainly a reflection upon the intelligence of those to whom these words are addressed. Such calumnies may be dismissed with one word. We Catholics adore the one true and living God, and Him alone do we worship with that supreme and absolute homage which belongs to Him as the Lord and Master of the Universe. This is our

profession, this our obligation, this our bounden duty through the whole of our lives. This is the whole duty of man, a duty which nothing, how important soever, can release us from, a duty which no one, not even God Himself, can excuse us from discharging. Well then, do we discharge this duty? Few, perhaps none, of us would like to think that we do not. Is it possible that our homage may be given elsewhere? Have we Catholics nothing to fear on this point? It may seem a strange thing to say, but there is danger of idolatry, even for us.

Plenty of idolatry is going on round about us. Not the idolatry of fanatic heathens who prostrate their bodies before stocks and stones, but an idolatry which has place among the educated and the refined, as well as among the ignorant and uncouth. Idolatry which is not confined to the poorer parts of the city, but which may be found in the national Universities, in smart Clubland, and in fashionable Belgravia, yes! and in almost every part of the country. There are thousands of idolaters walking about the city of London to-day. They may be found among all classes of men and of women, workers and idlers, Christians, nomin-

ally, every one of them. What are they worshipping? What is the god for which, and to which, they sacrifice their time, their ease, their convenience? What is that god for which they will undergo hardships and privations, toils and sufferings, for which they will risk health, and even life itself? Whose altar is that on which is sacrificed virtue, and truth, and honour, and honesty? What is that which commands the sacrifice of the eternal welfare of man's immortal soul and has the command obeyed? Surely it must be some powerful being, having beauty and wisdom and an attractiveness which appeals to all that is high and noble and worthy in man's character. It is not even a living thing! It is without intelligence or power or beauty. You may despise it with impunity, as the best and the noblest that the earth has ever seen have despised it. Without fear you may trample it under foot, you may cast it into the fire and the fire will change it into running liquid. It is powerless to cause a drop of rain to fall from the heavens, or one blade of grass to spring up from the earth. It cannot save from sickness, and it mocks its votaries in death. Can a more despicable god be imagined

than this? And yet, behold the millions who are grovelling on the earth in adoration of the yellow god, GOLD. Is it not so in this enlightened city? Can too much be said about its power over mankind? Are not honoured names dragged down to the earth day after day by the servitude of their owners to the god of their hearts? Do you want a few British peers to lend their names to fraudulent companies, to illicit commercial transactions? Then make your price good enough and you can have them. "All things obey money." Honour and reputation and justice may go to the winds, so long as the god which is worshipped is secured. How it can drag men round the earth! If it be rumoured that it has appeared in any part of the globe where it has not been found before, a frantic flight to the newly-discovered shrine immediately follows. No follower of Mahomet ever went through such hardships and dangers to reach his Mecca, as so-called Christian men and Christian women have been through to reach the gold-fields of the world as they have been discovered. Money maddens, fevers, and frenzies men, and like the infatuated creatures who, as an act of worship of their deities, twist themselves

round and round, until overcome with dizziness, they fall upon the ground, so these gold-worshippers become bereft of all other but the one sense, and are happy even to fall, so long as in falling they can clutch their god.

None will deny that idolatry of gold is rampant to-day, and there are few who are unreached by its subtle influence. But has not money its uses? Undoubtedly it has, many and great and beneficent. Against these no sane man would raise his voice. What, however, calls for warning, if not for solemn denunciation, is the appalling fact that vast numbers make it the sole end and object of their labours and of their lives. When they do so, God is thrust aside. It does not seem profitable to serve Him, and everything is estimated, now-a-days, by how it pays. God, for the most part, reserves His rewards; men, for the most part, seek a god which rewards at once. So, even in modern times, the golden calf is the idol of millions. Perhaps most of us are congratulating ourselves that these remarks have no reference to us. We are quite sure idolatry has no hold on us. Possibly it is so. But are the beginnings of the disposition towards the worship of the golden

god altogether unknown within ourselves? Like other vices, its approaches are gradual and insidious. As with other vices, so with this: we can have the spirit without the actuality. It is possible for all grades of men, between the beggar and the millionaire, to become worshippers of Mammon, and for all there is the danger.

There will, no doubt, be some who will urge against what has been said, that the real reason why money is sought and why so much is sacrificed for its attainment, is not fairly stated. No one, they will argue, would seek money for its own sake. Could any one be so foolish? And, further, money is necessary; we cannot get on without it; we cannot all be monks and nuns and take vows of voluntary poverty. Let us answer the second objection first. Money is necessary, in so far as men have agreed that it shall be a token for value between them. It facilitates transactions which are of necessity in every society of men, and as things stand we cannot get on without it. But this is a very different thing from making it the be-all and end-all of our lives, our god. We cannot get on without air to breathe, but we do not fall down and worship it. As to not seeking

money for its own sake, is it universally true that this is never done? We have all heard of the miser gloating over his gold in dirt and deprivation. Joy to his touch and music to his ears are the golden coins, as he jingles them in his hand and counts them over and over. Though hunger and cold be upon him, he will not part with one of his little golden gods. But admittedly this is not frequently found, and, as a rule, money is sought, not for itself, but for the pleasures of life which it can bring. Certainly. No one denies it. The seeking of pleasure, excitement, amusement, and satisfaction of sense, is only another phase of modern idolatry.

If the love of money is not greater now than it has ever been, the same can hardly be said with regard to pleasure and luxury and excitement. The worship of these things is patently increasing. To lessen the serious meaning of life; to magnify the importance of the present; and to minimise that of the future life; is the sole aim of millions. There is one thing necessary, that is, to enjoy life. What doth it profit a man if he save his own soul, so long as he has not what is called "a good time" here? The Scripture order is inverted. Love the

world and the things that are in the world; amuse yourself; eat, drink and be merry; let the future take care of itself; deny yourself nothing; the world was made for pleasure, and you were made to enjoy it. Such, one might conclude, would be the voice of the world interpreted by its acts.

How the frivolities of the day enter into the lives of millions! Go to a railway bookstall; see the ten thousand various journals of every conceivable sort and colour. They are not there to ornament the stall. The public calls for them. They afford excitement and amusement. How many among the thousands of journals, which are to be seen in the hands of our people, tend to elevate or to instruct?

Another object of modern idolatry is sport. Is sport to be condemned? Of course not; it has its place in the rational recreation of the people of the country. It has many benefits, and long may we be marked out as the leading nation in all manly exercises and honest sport. But sport must not become our national god. Gambling and betting, with all their pernicious effects, follow close upon the heels of sport. What does a large proportion of the newspaper-reading public occupy itself with?

Ask the newspaper boys in the streets which is their most remunerative cry, and they will tell you, "All the winners!" They know the public thought as well as the profoundest philosopher, and perhaps better. What does all this point to? To a gradual loosening of the bonds of duty which we owe to God as His creatures. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, with thy whole soul, with all thy strength, and with all thy mind." Thou shalt have no other gods but Me, thou shalt adore Me, and thou shalt serve Me alone.

These are the commands of God, which for a time men may despise, but disobedience to which He Who made them must vindicate. There is little doubt of the tendency of modern thought and modern action. It is not towards God, it is away from Him. It is not to the worship of God, but to the worship of wealth and ease and self-indulgence. It is not to obedience and subjection, but to revolt and independence and licence. This is modern idolatry, against which every true and every loyal servant of God must declare war until the end, and with which no one can declare a truce and not be a traitor.

RELIGION ON PRINCIPLE

(Words spoken to the Brothers of the Little Oratory, Brompton, on their Annual Festival)

THERE is a wonderful story which we read in the Book of Daniel the Prophet. King Nabuchodonosor having conquered Jerusalem, took back with him to Babylon the flower of the young men of Judea; among these were three young men of noble birth, who surpassed all others in comeliness and learning, and King Nabuchodonosor gave orders that they were to be clothed with the most sumptuous raiment, fed upon the daintiest meats and given the choicest wines, that they might advance in beauty and strength. But these young men, Ananias, Misael and Azarias, or as they were now known, Sidrach, Misach and Abdenago, refused to eat of the rich meats prepared for them, or to drink of the wines, as it was unlawful for them as faithful Jews to do so. They declined to sacrifice one iota of the outward observance of

their religion. However, they continued to grow in stature and comeliness and knowledge, and King Nabuchodonosor, consulting them on matters of import, found them to be wiser than the best of his wise men, and setting Daniel over all his provinces as Governor, he placed Sidrach, Misach and Abdenago over the works. So far, while declining to sacrifice the outward observance of their religion in the smallest degree, they had prospered, but the trial, and a severe one, was yet to come.

King Nabuchodonosor commanded a statue of gold to be made and put up, and when this was done he called upon all his nobles, all magistrates, judges, captains, rulers and all the chief men of the provinces, commanding them that when they should hear the sound of the trumpet, the flute, the harp, sackbut, psaltery, and symphony, and all kinds of music, they should fall down and adore the golden statue which King Nabuchodonosor had set up. And at the signal all the nations and tribes and languages fall down. No; not all. Some Chaldeans come to King Nabuchodonosor and accuse the three Jews, Sidrach, Misach and Abdenago, of disobeying the King's edict. They

said to him, "You have set these men over your Provinces, but they will not obey your word."

Nabuchodonosor commanded that the three young men should be brought before him. "Is this true?" he asks. "If you obey not my commands, you will not lose your positions merely, but you shall be cast into the furnace of burning fire, and who is the God who shall deliver you out of my hand?" They replied: "We need not answer, for our God is able to deliver us. But if He will not, we will not do it."

The King, terrible in his wrath at their defiance, orders his slaves to heat the furnace seven times hotter. The strongest men in the King's army bind the hands and feet of Sidrach, Misach and Abdenago, and clothed as they are, even to the caps upon their heads, they are thrown in. The furnace was by now so hot, that it actually killed, with its burning breath, the men who acted as executioners. Yet God preserves the three Jews in a most marvellous manner. What has happened? Instead of being shrivelled up by the destroying blast of the flames, the three young men are seen walking about within them unharmed. And now they are joined by a fourth; an angel of

the Lord has come to them to strengthen them, and they give voice to one of the most sublime hymns in praise of God that has ever been uttered, while the flames play round their garments harmlessly. King Nabuchodonosor, filled with admiration, cries: "Blessed be their God, for there is no other God who can save in this manner," and decreeing punishment to those who should utter any word against their God, he promotes Sidrach, Misach and Abdenago, and publishes the glory of their God in these words: "It hath seemed good to me therefore, to publish His signs, because they are great, and His wonders, because they are mighty, and His Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, and His power to all generations." The religion of the three Hebrew youths was founded on principle.

Let me invite you to witness another scene. The year is 312. It is winter in the city of Sebaste, in Armenia. Four legions of Roman soldiers were quartered in the city, and often when the relief sentinels went their rounds, they found more than one companion frozen at his post. The Roman Governor in that part of the country still clung to the idea that he would be able to effect that

which ten persecutions had not been able to effect, namely, to efface the Christian religion.

In one of the four legions were forty soldiers who were valiant confessors of Christ. They were true soldiers of the Emperor, but they were loyal soldiers of Jesus Christ. Their comrades were idolaters, and the forty refused to share in the worship of their fellows. The commander-in-chief heard of this, and calling them forth, commanded their compliance. On their refusing, they were beaten with rods, their flesh torn with leaden whips, they were tortured and racked in the presence of the army. What shame for brave men! Some of them bore the testimony to their valour in the decorations on their breasts. One at least bore the most honoured gift of the army, equal to our Victoria Cross. Valour for empire was only surpassed by their valour for Christ. But they must be bent and their courage must be broken.

It is a bitter January night. Marcus Attilius is merry with wine, and in his excess he declares that he will bend or break them. Imagine yourselves in the great square of the city. Four companies of Roman soldiers are drawn up. On one side you might see a great pool, frozen to its depths. Let

us try to make the picture more real. We stand in Trafalgar Square. The square is one mass of frozen water. The four companies of soldiers stand with their backs to Parliament Street. Opposite is the National Gallery. Imagine this a temple to Mars the god of War and to the fortune of the Empire. "Stand forth, ye forty worshippers of Christ." They stand forth. They repeat their refusal to worship the false gods. They will sacrifice only to the one true and living God. This is their faith. "Let them be stripped, and placed upon the ice to die, to perish of cold. But look towards the temple of the gods, look at the glow of warmth and comfort within, seek the protection of the gods, and that shall be your shelter, and food and wine shall comfort you, and to-morrow you shall have promotion."

Imagine the enormity of their trial. On the one side, torment and death; on the other, ease, comfort and honour. Listen; it is the Christian captain who speaks. "We are soldiers, we love our Emperor, we are loyal to the army, we have rendered to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, but we shall ever render to God the things that are God's. We will not worship your gods, and if we have to die

upon the ice, we will meet death with as stout a heart for our God and for our religion as ever we faced it on the field of battle, for our home and for our Emperor."

And now the square is still. The military companies have departed, the stars look down from a frosty sky, and the moon shows the forty confessors of Christ standing upon the frozen pool. Beyond, from the temple door, streams forth a cheerful glow of warmth; couches with leopard skins stretched, invite the wearied and the cold; and the odour of spiced wine is wafted over the pool. "God grant that none of us turn back," cries one. "Forty athletes, O Lord," cries another, "forty we have entered the arena, let forty victors receive the prize." Soon some fell, their hearts' blood frozen by the cold; some sank down to sleep that sleep which ends only in death; others were lost in prayer. What faith! what endurance! Was their faith sound, think you? Aye, it was great, it was heroic. It need be for such a trial. A captain is waiting in the house next the temple, waiting to receive the waverers, and waiting long, he falls asleep. And as he sleeps he sees a vision of an angel coming down from the heavens with

one golden crown after another, until nine and thirty golden crowns were brought, but not the fortieth. He starts out of his sleep. "Is it thus," he asks a soldier near, "that their God rewards them? But there are forty, are there not?" Just now a movement is heard, and the cry, "The soldier Quintilius is willing to sacrifice; he has come in." The captain will go out and see the rest. As he passes he sees Quintilius. Clothes have been put upon him, his limbs are being rubbed into life before a roasting fire, hot wine is restoring him; he is feeling the comforts of renouncing his faith. Alas! poor Quintilius, who will congratulate him! Out into the night goes the pagan captain, and he hears a feeble voice saying, "Forty athletes we have entered the arena, O Lord, let forty victors receive the prize." "Ah," answers the captain, "that's past praying for, one of your number has sacrificed." "O God, grant forty victors still," continues the feeble voice. How wonderful the power of prayer! How efficacious the intercession of the martyrs! Look at the splendid form of the pagan centurion. What has happened? He falls upon his knees, as the light from on high enters his soul, the light of the

Christian faith, and he worships the God of the Christians. "Quintilius has fallen from his crown; O God of the Christians, grant it to me; I believe, O Lord—I repent; accept me." Soon he is stripped and is thrown upon the frozen pool, where he receives the martyr's baptism. Prayer has prevailed; forty athletes entered the arena, forty victors have received the prize.

Brethren, the days of open persecution are over, and perhaps it seems superfluous to recall these deeds of heroic faith. Is there any need for us to recall such scenes of martyrdom for the faith? Is there anything calling for the spirit of the martyrs amongst us at the present day? The faith, thank God, is ours, but the allurements of the world are terrible. This present life and its requirements are so absorbing, and the facilities offered for improving our lot in life are so numerous and so attractive, that one of the greatest of the present day problems which confront those who by God's appointment are the custodians of the souls of His people, is what to oppose to the temporal and most advantageous attractions which abound on every side, not directly drawing away from the faith and its practices, but inevitably, though

imperceptibly, lessening the hold of that faith on the soul. Religious practices and spiritual matters are not, and cannot be, naturally so attractive as those things, the fruits and rewards of which are so apparent. How powerful to absorb and to hold the attention of men and of women, are those things which wealth can command! Personal advantage, recreation, position in life, can all be ours if we can command the money to secure them. And money is found in abundance for these things, and many of them are within the reach of all. Do not let me be misunderstood to say that any of these things are unlawful, or even undesirable. All I say is, that religion, faith—our faith—is at a tremendous disadvantage in its effort to lay hold of the young men and young women, and make them loyal adherents of the supernatural, while so much that is clearly to their present advantage draws them to the natural and the temporal. What have we got to oppose to the unlimited resources which supply our young people with opportunities for what is called bettering themselves, elevating and improving their condition, intermingled with a good share of amusement and pleasure? Magnificent premises, excellent teachers, suitable rewards

are all at the command of any who wish to improve their worldly education. They may learn engineering or carpentering, dressmaking or millinery, music or singing, or languages, or science or art, and learn them well. They may hear interesting lectures upon various subjects, a splendid library is at their disposal, and dancing and free excursions come in to relieve the monotony of the more serious pursuits. And all this for nothing, or for the merest trifle. Let me repeat that these things in themselves are excellent. But there is a danger, and an enormous one. But how? No religion is introduced, no religious tests are applied, no one is asked about his faith, all is open to all, only the temporal advantage of all is aimed at. True; but religion and all that belongs to it compares very unfavourably in its possible advantages with the apparent advantages offered by these opportunities, and the result is that religion remains only for the strong. The Catholic Church is poor in this world's gifts. She does not, because she cannot, hold out to her children any hope of worldly advantage as a reward for loyalty to God and to herself. Worldly prosperity was never made by Jesus Christ the hallmark of the genuineness of His religion,

and His Church has not any worldly prosperity to offer. No; the Church cannot compete with the enormous human attractions which are found outside of her; but this she has, and offers to all, the means of eternal life, and the riches which do not rust and the treasure which the moth cannot destroy.

But are we not secured from succumbing to the allurements of the world and its advantages by our faith? We are not secured by any faith, but the real. In order to resist in these days, weak faith, unstable faith, is no good. Strong faith, firm faith —nay, heroic faith is required. Something of the faith of the martyrs must be ours, if we would stand upon the freezing ice of our own poverty and our own disadvantages awaiting our crowns, while the warmth and the glow and the inviting odours of the temples of false gods invite and allure us. Flesh and blood unassisted cannot hold out; absolute heroism in our faith is the only thing to enable us to suffer when no present advantage is offered. To suffer always requires courage, to suffer for our faith requires heroism, to die to temporal advantages for the sake of our faith requires heroism, the heroism of the martyrs. Only such faith as this is safe. Martyrdom may be for all of us, though not

for all of us in the same manner. Often it is on a battlefield where no clash of earthly combatants is heard; sometimes the arena is no wider than a single humble home; sometimes it consists of patient endurance; sometimes of active opposition; at other times it means warfare against a tyranny; or it may mean a tearing away of oneself from friends or party for the sake of a religious conviction. Martyrdom may be the bold declaration of a Catholic truth or principle in the face of a jeering and sneering world. It always demands a firm belief in, and a practical demonstration of, the eternal principle of "God and my soul first, and anything or everything else afterwards"; it is always a declaration that there are worse evils than pain and poverty and persecution; that there are higher blessings than pleasure and success and wealth; that there are worse evils by far than those which the world dreads, and higher blessings by far than those for which it toils. But Martyrdom is always heroism—the outcome of heroic faith. Martyrdom is only for those whose religion is based on principle; and the spirit, if not the actuality, of martyrdom is for all true disciples of Christ.

THE CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH

(*Lecture: Hammersmith Town Hall*)

The Old Dispensation was limited to one people, one nation, one quarter of the world.

The people of the world were divided into the sons of God and the sons of men. The sons of God were the Hebrew nation; the sons of men were the Gentiles, or the rest of mankind. The Church of God was a national Church; such was God's providence, and (outside the nation of the Jews) God's own religion was not, as such, the professed religion of any nation. In the several books of the Old Testament there is abundant evidence that this condition of things was not to last. There was to be a great change, and God was to be worshipped in spirit and in truth by the Gentiles also. There was to come a time when this nationality in religion was to be broken up, and a religion which should be world-wide was to take its place. There was an indication of it before the eyes of every

Hebrew who could read the books of the Old Testament. He had only to go to the Prophecy of Malachias, and there he could read: "From the rising of the sun, even unto the going down, My Name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My Name a clean oblation; for My Name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal. i. 11). In the Psalms they might read the words of David, speaking in the person of the Messiah Who was to come, and saying: "The Lord hath said to me. . . . Ask of Me and I will give thee the Gentiles for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."

In many other parts of the Old Testament there are clear indications of the future dispensation of God with regard to religion being universal. Indeed it was part of their own national aspirations that they themselves, under the Leader who was to come, were to be the possessors of the whole earth, and that their own Jewish religion was to be universal.

When the Founder of Christianity came, His teaching fully confirmed the indications of the Old Testament.

"This Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony to all nations" (Matt. xxiv. 14), and again: "Go ye," He said to His Apostles, "into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi. 15), and again, St. Luke records for us that the Lord said to them: "You shall be witnesses unto Me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost parts of the earth" (Acts i. 8).

But if we desire to hear Christ testifying to the universality of the Church which He had come to found, testifying to its threefold Catholicity or universality of place, of doctrine and of time, we must gather round Him on that wonderful occasion, recorded in the eighteenth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, when He is giving the commission, which was to last for all time, to His Apostles. It was after His resurrection, and He was soon going to leave them. Jesus had appointed the place of meeting, and He spoke to them saying: "All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I

am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxvii. 18–20).

Let us notice in these words the basis of the commission. "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth." Here we have direct assertion of an earthly and a heavenly sovereignty, absolutely without limit of any kind. "All power." Heaven and earth, or the whole universe being the bounds of the supreme and absolute power possessed by the Commissioner, He says, "Teach ye all nations." All nations form the limit of the charge. "Teach," He says, or "make disciples of," all. Teach them all that you have received upon My authority. Go on teaching so long as I am with you, "and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."

No one believing in the New Testament as the truth of God, can possibly deny that the Church founded by Him, whichever it was, and wherever it is—for I am not now asserting that it is this or that Church, but Christ's Church—undoubtedly had the commission to preach Christ's truth to all nations, and as a necessary consequence her mission and scope must be universal, or Catholic, with regard to place. If any country or any people are

not included in the comprehensive term, "All nations," that country and that people are not included in Christ's commission. If any time remains after the consummation of the world, then the teaching of Christ's Church will not extend to that time, according to the terms of the commission. If there are any doctrines necessary to salvation which Christ did not deliver to His Apostles, those doctrines cannot be taught; but if His own word is to stand and not to fail, all men, to the end of time, in all things whatsoever pertaining to eternal life, are to receive the teaching of the Church which He established.

This design of Christ with regard to His Church being evident, how was it to be carried into effect? From its very circumstances it excludes Him visibly remaining with the Church. He gave the commission only when He was going away; there is no mention made of any writing which was to convey His message; they are told simply to teach: but that teaching was to be of such extent with regard to place, to time and to matter, that nothing but a living body politic, or a perpetual society, could possibly carry out the terms of the commission. Only by being a society could the Church teach all

nations, only so, could she have in her the potentiality of fulfilling the commission in this sense. This is the sense in which the Church of Christ must be universal with regard to place; the reasons for it we shall consider presently. Let us first determine the real sense in which universality or catholicity must be understood by the Church. By doing so we shall anticipate some objections which would necessarily arise, if a wrong meaning of the word be taken.

We do not mean that she must necessarily exist in every country of the globe simultaneously. We do not even mean that in point of numbers, at a given moment, she must exceed any or all of the various sects which may exist; we do not mean a mathematical universality. The Church of Christ existed before she was widely spread; she was as truly His Catholic Church on the day of Pentecost, as she is to-day. She was as truly Catholic while He was still in Judea, before an Apostle had left the Holy Land, as she was centuries later, when East and West had heard her message, and millions upon millions had claimed her as their mother, for she had in her the essential power of making herself universal. This power was planted

in her by her Maker, for if He meant her to teach all, and by her teaching to point out the way of salvation to all, He must have meant her to reach all, and have given her the power which was the means to the end. He must have meant her to strive without ceasing to enlarge her sphere and to "Deem nought done if aught remained to do," in carrying out her divine mission to the uttermost parts of the earth.

The Church of the Apostles was Catholic, not because she actually embraced all mankind, but because she had universal jurisdiction; because she had the right to teach all in the name of, and with the authority of Him Who had received the nations for His inheritance. She received of Christ universal and exclusive sway over the minds and the hearts of all, and that must be, and that is the claim of the Church which is of Christ, or she is none of His.

By what has been said, the actual universality of the Church is not excluded, it is only insisted upon that this is not necessary for her essential characteristic of Catholicity. Catholicity, or universality in this sense, was not meant by the Apostle when he said, "Yea, verily, their sound" (the sound of

those teaching and witnessing) "hath gone forth into all the earth, and their words to the ends of the world" (Rom. x. 18). A large portion of the world had not yet actually heard the words of the message.

In the East, St. Ignatius could write, in the second century, of the Bishops of the Church who "have their stations at the uttermost bounds of the earth." St. Justin, in the West, at the same period, could also write, "There is no race of men . . . among whom prayers and eucharists are not offered to the Father and Maker of the Universe through the name of the crucified Jesus" (*Dial, cum Tryphone,* n. 117). Yet neither of them meant the actual numerical and territorial universality of the Church. Though this is so, there is one Church which is found wherever the foot of man has penetrated. It must be remembered that the Church was bidden to "go forth." She was to reach in time the uttermost bounds of the earth; her mission was to be carried out by human agencies, though not by human means, and practically wherever lands have been trodden by the feet of strangers, those lands have heard the message of the Church of Christ. She understands the tenor of her divine commis-

sion, and wherever human beings are, human souls, saved by Jesus Christ, must be her conquest. Nor does she bring the message only, she brings also the means of salvation.

Her going forth must be perpetual, it must be marked through the whole extent of her life, ever active, ever evangelic and ever aggressive. The Church which Christ founded must be that one of which impartial history can testify that from the beginning of Christianity to the present day, her endeavour has been to propagate her faith yet more and more in foreign lands and among heathen people. Is there a Church which can show this fulfilling of the commission of Christ through all the centuries down to the present day? Before the seventeenth century no Church, save one, made any attempts to evangelise the heathen, and if it be said that there are foreign missioners of the Reformed Churches, Anglican, Lutheran, Calvinistic, Wesleyan, or any others, it must be answered that they are centuries too late in their action even supposing it were successful (and there is abundant evidence of its failure), to claim from that action the title of Catholic.

One Church alone has the testimony of history

to her persistent and undiminished evangelising of the heathen. This must be the Church of Christ; she alone has the true evangelising power. Now if the Church of Christ has this power within her; if she claims this universal submission; if she must cease to be the Church of Christ where she ceases to assert her right to be the sole authorised guardian and the bearer of the truth to all nations; there must be some underlying principle within her which establishes her claim, which is her exclusive possession, the absence of which must mark out any other claiming to be the Church of Christ, as a pretender.

Without the conserving principle of unity in faith, no body can ever possibly have the mark of universality. Before a society goes forth to carry a message delivered to it, absolute certainty with regard to the nature and extent of that message is a necessity. The society is to multiply in its original form, or it will not be the original society. If it has not a bond, keeping it united as one and the same thing which it was before it set forth to diffuse itself, it has not the seed or germ of universal growth, and therefore can never attain it. Remember what the society has to do; nothing more, but

nothing less, than what was entrusted to it; to teach all nations not different doctrines, not opposing, conflicting, contradictory doctrines, but "all things whatsoever I have commanded." There must then be union of faith in the teachers. They must be agreed as to what those things are which they are commanded to teach. They must have a bond of unity in faith, before they can produce it. An army, to conquer, must be united, otherwise failure is inevitable. It never can subdue the world to one sceptre if its arms are turned against itself; and its arms must certainly turn against itself unless there is unity of purpose, of principle, and of government. Is there a Church visible to the world where this unity of faith is to be found? Is there a Church whose members agree in one faith with all their fellow members now upon the earth, and whose faith is one with all the members of that Church who have existed during the twenty centuries that have passed since the commission was given? If so, that Church is, and that Church alone can be, the Church which Christ established; to which He gave the Catholic, the universal commission to teach all nations. She alone can fulfil it, because she alone has the vital principle of unity within her.

Ask us how that vital principle is maintained and we answer, by virtue of the promise which was attached to her commission: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." It will be seen almost without demonstration that the Church of Christ, universal in its extent and object according to its constitution, must be governed by an authority which is universal in jurisdiction.

A vast community, spreading out in every direction, a body with nerves stretching to the ends of the earth, must have some head which bears a suitable relation to its character. A world-wide organisation must have some central government controlling the whole. There seems no alternative, but that a world-wide religion must have a world-wide government, and that government must be one, and supreme. Local administration there may, and there must, be; but if there be one society, with one object, with identical means of attaining it, then there must be one supreme jurisdiction. Now there is one Church where this is found, and one only. Who can deny that it is that Church whose nerve centre, whose supreme government, whose visible head, is in the City of Rome? The

principle of supremacy is admitted, in practice, by those who do not own her government. Wherever the supremacy of her government has been rejected, it has been rejected in favour of some other supremacy, as, for instance, in this country. The supremacy of the Pope was rejected, and the supremacy of the monarch established. The principle must be the same, it merely turns upon the extent of the system to be governed; if the body be a local one, a national one, if it be the religion of a nation, then a national head is sufficient; if it be the religion of universality, as the Catholic religion, then a head is required which knows no limit of territory; a head which can be the head of all the nations which are included in the commission. Thus all who are in communion with the one head are kept under one control. How necessary this is, if unity is to be maintained with regard to what is believed, is evident from the state of confusion and contradiction into which the members of the various sects have fallen. Take, for example, the body which is known to the world as the Church of England. Those who are members of that body at the present moment, are not really, however they may be nominally, under her control either as to

doctrines of faith, or precepts of morality. First of all, they who are in nominal control are not agreed as to points of faith; a fact so evident that it needs no demonstration. Her precepts can be defied with impunity; if she makes a law, her members are at liberty to obey or to reject it as they will. If to-morrow, the bishops of the Church of England were to declare that confession of sins was obligatory, obedience would be refused by thousands, and yet they profess to believe them to be the teachers appointed by God.

This indisputable fact, that within her are found the elements of certain discord and contradiction, excludes her from any claim to be the Church sent to teach all nations all truth to the end of time. Judged from this standard, the Church of England is not, and cannot be, Catholic.

What a different picture is that presented by an ancient writer—

"The Church, spread over the whole world to the earth's boundaries . . . having received the faith . . . guards it sedulously . . . and its truths she uniformly holds, as having one soul, and one and the same heart; and these truths she proclaims and teaches and hands down uniformly, as though

she had but one mouth. For though throughout the world the languages are various, still the force of the tradition is one and the same. And neither do the Churches founded in Germany, nor those of Spain, in Gaul, in the East, in Egypt, in Africa, nor in the regions of the middle of the earth believe or deliver a different faith" (*Adv. Her. Lit.* l. c. x. n. 1, 3).

Yes; the universality of the faith, both as regards those holding it, and what they held, was as plain to St. Irenæus, the Greek Father who wrote those words in the second century, as it is to-day. The words point unmistakably to one body, one heart, one soul, one mouth; thinking, doing, speaking one thing. In place and in doctrine, in government and in jurisdiction, the Church of Christ is Catholic or universal.

She is also universal in point of time. No one can fix the date when she began to be, unless it be the date of the beginning of Christianity. No one can point to her inventor, other than the God made Man. Down through the ages she is traced with no uncertain hand; writ large across the pages of the world's history are the words, "Catholic Church." One Church alone can claim the title,

and have her claim allowed. If we ask the writers of the third fourth and fifth centuries, which Church in their day was the Catholic Church, they reply with one voice, the Church which is in communion with the Bishop of Rome. "If Roman," writes St. Jerome, "be the answer he makes when you ask him his faith, then know that he is Catholic."

It was judged that the true Catholic faith was held by those whose faith was that held by the Apostolic and Roman See. Now, if the title Catholic was the test by which the true Church was distinguished from heretical sects in the early centuries, and if the title, Catholic, was tested by communion with the Roman and Apostolic See then, the Catholic Church of to-day must be able to stand the same test. One Church alone can do so in reality. To her alone, in truth and in justice, the title Catholic belongs. She has a trinity of titles; she is Catholic, Roman and Apostolic; she possesses them severally and jointly; no one can take them from her, none can share them with her. The Catholic Church and the Roman and Apostolic See have never parted company.

Perhaps we shall hear as an objection to the

name Catholic, that it is not found within the pages of the Gospels. Neither is the name Christian; but that which essentially signifies the Catholic Church is found, and is found especially in the words of her commission.

Only three times in other parts of the New Testament is the word, Christian, found, and if the argument be insisted upon that the members of the Church founded by Christ were not Catholic, because they were not called so, it would follow that they were not Christian until they were called such, which was at Antioch, some time after the teaching of the Apostles had been going on, and after considerable numbers had been received into the Church.

Even in the earliest days it was necessary to use the word Catholic, to distinguish between those who held the true faith which had been delivered by the Apostles, and those who, following the light of private judgment, claimed to be Christians, though they held what was delivered to them by some who had broken away from the one faith. When a man acknowledged himself a Catholic, he acknowledged himself a Christian, who believed in common with all true Christians, not what was

taught by a sect which had cut itself off from the rest. Christian was their name, Catholic their surname.

It may be interesting to mention a few facts about the name Catholic. So far as we know, it is first met with in the Epistle of St. Ignatius, martyr, of the second century.

After exhorting the Faithful to obey the Bishop, and vigorously warning them against schism, he says: "Where the Bishop is, there also the people should be, as where Jesus Christ is, there also is the Catholic Church" (*Lit. ad Smyrn.*, c. 8. 2).

The author of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, in relating the particulars of the martyrdom, says—

"He (Polycarp) had ended the prayer in which he made commemoration of all who had ever conversed with him . . . and of the whole Catholic Church spread all over the world" (A.D. 155).

Early in the second century the name Catholic was in common use, and it was the standard by which one was judged to belong to the Universal Church.

St. Augustine said it was the name Catholic which kept him in the Church. It is he also who

speaks of a stranger asking a heretic where the Catholic Church is, and, heretic though he was, he would not dare to show him any other than the genuine.

A change has come in England with regard to the word Catholic. Fifty or sixty years ago I doubt if there could be found as many members of the Church of England who would acknowledge that they were Catholics; to-day there are many who claim to be such, while many actually of the same body, with greater consistency, claim the name of Protestant. Some go so far as to say that the Church in this land, in communion with Rome, is not the Catholic Church at all, but a schismatic Church. This is not a new charge; listen to some one making answer to a similar charge many years ago—

"You say to us that we have sunk into a part, that we are not in the whole; we whose communion is diffused throughout the whole world—but as, were you to tell me that I am (you) Petilian, I could not find any other way of refuting you, but to laugh at you as joking, or to grieve for you as mad, so ought I clearly to treat you now; but as I do not think that you are joking

. . . you see the consequence" (*Lit. cont. Petilian.*, n. 90).

St. Augustine must have enjoyed this little pleasantry when he penned it some fourteen hundred years ago, to one who made the same remark as is now made frequently with regard to the Church of which he was so brilliant an ornament.

It would be well to draw attention to the fact that schisms are not destructive of the mark of Catholicity. Schisms may come, and have come, but what do they do? They simply reveal the divinity of the Catholic Church, which, notwithstanding, still remains what she was. Look at the great Greek schism; did they who broke away retain members in every part of the earth in communion with them? They were out of the unity of Christendom. Similarly in the sixteenth century, when this land broke away from the centre of Catholicity, with whom was she in unity? Did the Catholics of the world regard her as Catholic? Did she then, or does she now, hold the universal faith which is held by the 250 to 300 millions of Catholics in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, Australia? If she does not, then she is not

Catholic in the sense which, from the first days of Christianity, has been regarded as truly Catholic, namely, that her faith is that which from all time has been delivered and received in every quarter of the world.

A small, though perhaps pertinent, digression may be allowed, before bringing our subject to a close. The greatest thing, next to the Catholic Church, which the world has ever seen, is the British Empire. Shortly after the accession of the late King, we were forcibly reminded of this by the extended voyage of the then Prince of Wales to various parts of the Empire. In the course of his travels tens of thousands of miles were traversed, and an almost endless variety of races was seen. They included men of every shade of opinion, of different religious belief. All these, however, are bound together by a bond of union which stretches over continent and over ocean; a bond formed of links of loyalty towards the mother country, which is recognised as the centre of the Empire, as the pivot of the huge wheel of Empire, which has the whole world for circumference.

Suppose that the Prince of Wales of a little more

than a hundred years ago had undertaken a similar voyage, a round of visits to the British Colonies. He would have visited a vast land and a great people, who were not visited on the recent voyage. Little more than one hundred years ago, what is now known as the United States of America was part of the British Empire. Repudiating the Government of the mother country, she struck for her freedom, and she won it, and on September 3rd, 1783, Great Britain acknowledged her independence.

Now America may be great, she may be wealthy, she may glory in her independence, but she cannot glory in being part of the British Empire. She was part once; she deliberately cut herself off, and if having done so she were to affirm that she is the only real and original British Empire, she would become the laughing-stock of the world.

Similarly the Anglican Church. Some few hundred years ago she was part of the universal empire of the Catholic Church. She struck for her independence; she renounced her allegiance to what was then universally regarded as the central government of the Church of Christ, and by this renunciation she severed herself from the centre of Catholic unity.

The Anglican Church may be great, she may be wealthy, she may be considered by many glorious in her independence, but she is not, and, in her present attitude of rejection of Apostolic authority, she can never be, the Catholic Church or any part of it.

Heresy or schism, however widely spread, takes nothing from the note or mark of the Catholicity of the Church. From the beginning there have been those who received the Gospel, as well as those who mutilated it, those who rejected it. So it will be till the end of time. The Catholicity of the Church is not destroyed or imperilled. What is essential for her Catholicity is, that in point of space the boundaries of the earth are her only limit; in point of doctrine she was in the beginning, she is now, and she must always continue to be, the depository, the guardian and the teacher of all truth; and as to time, she must last, as He Who made her said, "even to the consummation of the world," for He Who made her is the One unchanged, unchanging, and unchangeable God.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH

(Hammersmith Town Hall)

The Catholic Church teaches that Christ intended and commanded that there should be unity of faith in all the members of His Church. There was to be one body and one spirit. External unity was to have as the foundation, internal consent to the same truths; minds and souls were to be joined in unity of belief and in profession of that belief. The disciples of Christ were to speak the same thing; there were to be no schisms among them; they were to be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment. For this Christ Himself had prayed. He prayed for His disciples, and not for them only, but for them also who through their word should believe in Him. And what was the burden of His prayer? "That they all may be one, as Thou, Father in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us." And the tremendous effect of this unity between Christ and His disciples, and between those who should be taught

of them, was, "that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me" (John xvii. 21, 22).

The divine mission of Christ was to be proved to the world by the unity which should exist between His real disciples. Think for a moment of what the unity of God with Christ consisted. They were one in nature, one in mind, one in love. There was perfect love identifying them, but there was also absolute conformity of mind, arising from the possession by each, of all truth. The unity which Christ prayed for, could not be obtained unless there was conformity of mind among the disciples, and conformity of all with Christ, and so with God. Christ is God; God is truth; Christ therefore is truth. Conformity with the mind of Christ is conformity with the mind of God, and this cannot be in two disciples of Christ, unless they are in conformity the one with the other. Here is one disciple of Christ; his mind assents, for instance, to this proposition: Jesus Christ instituted on this earth a means of forgiving sins, through the instrumentality of man. Here is another disciple of Christ, whose mind assents to the contradictory: Christ did not institute any means on earth by which, through the instrumentality of man,

sins should be forgiven. It is quite clear that both of these cannot be in conformity with the mind of Christ, for He either did, or did not, institute such a means.

Unity in faith is a necessary condition of discipleship of Christ. He intended that all His disciples should be of one mind with Him, and to be so they must be one in faith. Now when He was no longer to teach on earth, He gave the same power as He possessed to His Apostles. "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth, going, therefore, teach all nations. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned." The Holy Spirit was to come, Who should teach them all truth, Who should abide with them for ever, the Spirit of Truth. "He who hears you, hears Me. He who hears Me, hears God." The Father sent Him that men might hear Him, that hearing they might believe, and believing they might be saved.

The Apostles, the first teachers of the Church, were invested with the teaching power of Christ Himself, and with the same authority; to be rejected, only at the same penalty. "He that despises you, despises Me," and therefore no one

could repudiate or refuse to give consent of mind to one iota of the Apostles' teaching, without by so doing, denying Christ's divine authority.

Was the apostolic commission and teaching power to die with the Apostles? Consider the nature and the extent of the work given them to do, and the promise of unceasing abiding presence, and it is evident that it was not. The apostolic mission was to the human race—"preach the Gospel to every creature." The Apostles, then, must be His witnesses to the ends of the earth. How could the command be fulfilled? Only by the teaching, witnessing, and governing power which they had received, being handed on to others. This must have been what Christ intended. Others must succeed them in the ministry of the word. Faithful men should be the human means by which the Spirit of Truth should continue to teach the human race. This was the method the Apostles pursued. They appointed and ordained other men, and in effect they said to them: "All power is given to us by Jesus Christ. He sent us, so we send you. Going, therefore, teach as we have taught. The same power and authority is yours as is ours; ours is of Christ, and Christ's is of God. Your

power, your authority to teach, is therefore of God." Unless the Apostles had done this they would not have carried out the command of Christ. Here was the power of the magisterium instituted by Christ. They were the teaching power. They were to teach what Christ taught, but nothing more. They were to teach all that Christ taught, and all that they taught was to be received as taught by Him. Christ had required entire assent of the mind to each and every truth which He proposed. He made no exceptions. All who heard Him teach, if they wished for salvation, must give the consent of their minds to the whole teaching, and to every point of the teaching, as it became known to them. To withhold consent from any single point, was to deny His divine authority, or to call into question His divine knowledge. To hear Him was to hear God; and when God is heard, complete and absolute assent must be given to His voice. Reject any portion of the teaching of the Church as to faith, and you thereby reject all, inasmuch as you reject the authority upon which all depends.

The early Church acted upon this principle. None of the early heretics rejected the whole of the Church's teaching. They rejected one or other point of it, and because of this they were cut off

from the Church, they were no longer regarded as Catholics. The Arians, the Montanists, the Novatians and others, held many points of Catholic doctrine; they rejected one or other and for this reason were cut off from the body of Christ, and from communion with that body. They were no longer the disciples of the visible teaching body, which taught with His authority. Here, unity was being preserved by means of the living, authoritative, and permanent teaching power, established by Christ. This was the first great office of the Church of Christ.

Without faith it is impossible to be saved; but faith alone will save no man. The Church had to sanctify mankind. The grace of God was to flow into the souls of men, in the ordinary course, through her ministrations. She was to teach the right worship of God; to offer to all the means of participating in the salvation which Christ died to secure. The Apostles were appointed the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God, and these mysteries of God are found chiefly in the divine Sacrifice and in the dispensation of the Sacraments. Man was not to be left to himself to determine in what way he should worship God; the Apostles were to teach this also. They

were told to baptise, and to "Do this in commemoration of Me." "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them," was the indication of a further power. "Feed My lambs, feed My sheep." This gave the chief of the Apostles the charge to govern with authority, the whole flock of Christ. All these things were necessary to the Church as a divine society, more perfect in its organisation, because higher in its end, than any human society. The end of all human societies is in one sense or another the good of its members, and every society which aims at an end, must have means proportioned to that end, and must place them before the members of the society. The divine society, instituted by Christ, must possess therefore, the means, and must have the power, to bring all her members into conformity in the use of these means adapted to her end. In other words, the unity of that Church, which is of Christ, must extend to the essentials of her worship and of her sacraments; she must be one in these, one in all times, and in all places, and we must apply this test to any Church claiming to be the Church of Christ.

We have considered two kinds of unity in the

Church of Christ, unity of doctrine and unity of worship. It is evident, however, that these could not long exist unless there were some power, which from the beginning, had been able to command absolute obedience to the doctrine and strict observance in the substantial essence of worship and sacraments. This brings us to the subject of unity of government, and the correlative, unity of obedience.

A world-wide society, having entrusted to it an unique and an unalterable message, must have such a government as should ensure in the bearers delivering, and the hearers receiving the original message, in all its purity and integrity. This could only be effected by Christ, "the Master and Lord," providing, that when His visible presence should be removed from earth, one should hold His place, Who in all things, should discharge His office. He did so provide when He made St. Peter His vicegerent. Christ was the one head of His new Kingdom established on the earth. All were subject to Him, all must obey Him. Union with Him, and obedience to Him, can alone secure union with, and obedience to, the truth. He must govern all, and He alone. The teachers and the taught are secure,

only when governed by Him. He provides for a continuance of this in His Church. There must be union of faith among the teachers; they must be one in faith, before their teaching can produce oneness in the taught, and there must be some supreme, infallible judge to decide, should doubt arise, as to the extent of the subject matter to be taught. All taught by them must receive the same truth, and in their turn, with due appointment, hand it on to others. Would it not have been trifling with the truth of Christ, if the Apostles had taught after the manner of some authorised teachers of a Church which declares itself to be the Church of Christ? Suppose that one of the original teachers, claiming to be an Apostle of Christ, had taught at Ephesus, that what is known as the Holy Eucharist is the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, really and substantially present under the appearances of bread and wine; and another making the same claim, had taught in Jerusalem, that this was nothing more than a figure, that substantially the Holy Eucharist was still bread and wine; and yet another, at Corinth, had taught that it was the one or the other, according to the estimate or belief of the person considering it; could any reasonable man believe

that all these were teaching what Christ had commanded? How were these men exhibiting in their teaching the fruit of Christ's prayer, "That they may be one as Thou Father in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us"?

No one could urge in such a supposition the weak argument that only unity in fundamental truths is necessary. Who shall decide what fundamental truths are? Some will exclude from them what others include, and there can never be any agreement. But supposing this distinction valid, can any doctrine be more vital and fundamental than that which determines our giving to God that adoration which is due to Him, and to Him alone, which if given to another is idolatry? If we follow St. John in his supposed teaching, we must give to the Holy Eucharist the same supreme adoration as we give to God, but if we follow St. James in his supposed teaching, and we still give supreme adoration to the Holy Eucharist, we are idolaters; while if we follow St. Paul we may do one thing to-day, and another to-morrow. What to-day is our Lord and our God, to-morrow is mere bread and wine; it depends on our estimate of it. No; these teachers, we should have concluded, are not

they who received from Christ the commission to teach; to whom was promised the ever-abiding presence of the Spirit of Truth, for they must undoubtedly all teach the same, because what they teach must be true, and truth is one. And if that must have been our conclusion then, what must be the conclusion of any logical mind, if in a body claiming to be the Church of Christ, the same evidence of disunion is manifested to-day?

His Church, which is Catholic in time and in place, must also be Catholic in truth. She must ever teach the same truths; she must teach them everywhere; she must teach the same to all. What an impression it makes when one realises this wonderful fact for the first time! One hears some point of Catholic truth being explained in a Catholic Church in London, and he knows that if he goes on to the Continent, he will hear the same truth taught there. If he leaves Europe and sails to America, if he traverses the immense continent of Asia, if he extends his journey to far-off Africa, everywhere, in great city or little village, under magnificent cathedral dome or humble thatch-roofed chapel; everywhere, if the Catholic Church teaches, she teaches the same. What a

wonderful unity existing between people divided by time and distance, varying in language, in customs, in interests; differing in all things, but one in faith. What is the vital principle whence such a wonderful result follows? It can only come from possession of the truth, the result of the abiding presence of the Spirit of Truth, according to the promise of Christ, "He shall abide with you." But something more is required. A foundation must be in proportion to the building which it supports. Christ, when erecting His Church, was Himself, primarily and principally, and of His own right, the foundation. He was pleased, however, to establish a visible foundation, which should be the visible principle of cohesion for a visible Church. His Church was to rest on Blessed Peter, and all who should find themselves in communion with him might be assured that they were of the Church which was built upon the rock. Let what explanation soever be given to the words of Christ, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church," they can never, by any warrantable interpretation, be made to exclude St. Peter as in some way the foundation of the Church. Christ's Church was to last for ever.

Though Peter was to die, Peter's office was to live. Peter's successor, the chief Shepherd and chief Teacher, the living Apostle, was ever to be the foundation of the Church of divine truth, preserving it in all its strength, and in its destructible unity. But the Church of Christ was not only a house built upon a rock, it was a kingdom also, and to blessed Peter the promise was made, "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Then, to belong to the kingdom of Christ upon earth to-day, is to belong to him who holds and exercises the power of the keys in that kingdom to-day. That office of supreme power and jurisdiction was never meant to cease, when he who first received it should be no more. It, too, must last as long as the Church, and he who wields it to-day is Peter's successor. Blessed Peter was charged also with the duty of feeding the whole flock—both lambs and sheep—and this office must continue to the end.

There is one who holds that office now; he is the successor of St. Peter, coming down through a long unbroken line of supreme pontiffs. He holds supremacy of honour, of power and jurisdiction in the spiritual kingdom of Christ upon earth; and

unity is maintained among its many millions of members, by the acknowledgment of one supreme head, to whom all render obedience, and in whom all are bound into one body, of which he is the visible head. It is clear that nothing could produce that unity, which is the wonder of the world, save some central government, and that government must be one and supreme. Where in the whole world, among the numerous bodies claiming to be the Church of Christ, is there one which can show this mark of unity? There is one institution calling itself Christian, and one alone, which by its threefold unity of faith, of worship and of government, proves itself to be the institution founded by Christ. All its members agree in one faith, those who teach, and those who are taught; they agree in one faith, with all those countless millions who have lived and died since the day of Pentecost, when first the Spirit of Truth manifested Himself, not less than with the millions who profess the same truth to-day. They are united in worship by means of that clean Oblation, which in every place, from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, makes His name great among the Gentiles; they are united in obedience

to one, whom they believe to be the vicar of Christ, the successor of St. Peter, the chief Shepherd and Guardian of the flock of Christ upon earth.

Those who study the religious history of this country will find that for a thousand years she gave testimony to this threefold mark of unity. There was no division in the belief of the people of England for a thousand years. From one extremity of the land to the other, from north to south, from east to west, the Christian inhabitants confessed, not in word only, but in deed, one Lord, one faith, one baptism. There was one Church, one Creed, and those who recited it meant the same thing. The Archbishops of Canterbury were in perfect accord with their brothers the Archbishops of York, and with all the bishops of England. All her priests and all her people were united among themselves, and united to the rest of Christendom, in faith, in worship, in obedience. There were no opinions in matters of faith; no parties, no sects. England was Catholic, because her faith was that of the universal Church. No such distinction was heard of fundamental truths and non-fundamental, in the sense that it was of necessity to hold the former for communion with the

Church of God, and unnecessary to hold the latter. Whatever truths were proposed by the Church as articles of divine faith, were held all equally on the same principle. Bishops and priests taught here, what bishops and priests taught all over the world. They were in perfect union with the bishops of France, of Germany, of Italy, of the whole of Christian Europe. Worship was the same for all. Everywhere the sacrifice of the Mass was the chief Christian worship, and all believed the same thing with regard to that sacrifice. The seven sacraments were taught, and administered, and received, and the same thing was believed about them by all. One universal, supreme and final court of appeal was acknowledged in matters of faith, morals and discipline, and that court had as head the Bishop of Rome. Communion with him was regarded as essential to communion with the Christian Church.

England broke away from this communion in the sixteenth century, and in so doing she broke away from the Christian world. Since that day with whom has she been in religious communion? With whom has she been one in faith, one in worship, one in obedience?

This spectacle of religious unity and peace, once the happy lot of our land, should give pause to our fellow countrymen, as they contrast it with the state of religion in England to-day. The practical question for them is: "Does this come from the fact that we are separated from the acknowledged successor of Peter, the prince of the Apostles, the foundation of unity?"

THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH

(Kensington Town Hall)

No subject, perhaps, could more suitably engage the attention of thinking men, who give their thoughts to religious matters, than the subject of the authority of the Church of God. It lies at the very root of all religious questions, and if it could be finally and absolutely established, religious differences would cease to divide into opposing camps, as they do to-day, the religiously minded, earnest, good men and women of the country, who are to be found, thank God, in every religious denomination.

Whichever among the many Churches claiming the allegiance of Christians is in truth the Church of God, that Church, according to the demands of reason, and much more from the evidence of the sacred Scriptures, must be endowed with an authority which is not human but divine. If there is evidence of divine authority, there follows at once the necessity of human submission, and if

this divine authority has regard to what we shall believe and what we shall do, in order to our right worshipping of God, there ceases at once all power of personal choice, either in matters of religious belief, or in those of personal religious acting. If God has made known His mind and His will in the matter, there is an end to all questions in regard to our religious duties towards Him. They have been fixed by Himself. Indeed religion can mean nothing else but the discharge of our duty towards Him in the way He has made known. It seems to follow of direct necessity, if this is true, that God must have provided some certain and unfailing means by which His mind should be made known to us, so far as we are capable of understanding it, and some means by which we may know, with absolute certainty, what He wishes us to do. These two things could never be known to us unless, either God gave us a direct and personal revelation of them, and there are few who will claim this, or He has provided some certain, efficient and authoritative medium, by which we may attain to that knowledge. There must be a divinely authorised and recognisable teacher, and a divinely constituted judge and law-

giver, in matters relating to the worship of God under the new dispensation.

For the purpose of our subject, a belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God made man is presumed. Further, that He came upon earth not only to accomplish the fact of redemption, but also to provide a means by which, until the end of time men should be able to fulfil the conditions upon which alone that redemption should be available to them. That in order to do this He founded a society, or a church, in which, and by which, He intended the work to be continued which He came on earth to do. This is what Catholics believe, and this must be the conviction of every one who at all understands the economy of the Christian dispensation. Indeed it is almost impossible to imagine any other reason for the existence of a Church such as we understand the Church founded by Christ to be, namely, a society embracing all those who are followers of Christ, accepting His teaching and obeying His law because they believe both to be His. His teaching is made known to them by a witness with credentials which are unimpeachable, and His law is declared by an authority which is nothing if not His.

This conception of what the Church was to be, stands out on the very face of the New Testament. Christ as man was sent by the Father. He had a mission, or a commission, and that mission or commission He unequivocally declared should be continued by the Apostles and their successors. "As the Father sent Me, I also send you." The mission which the Father had given Him extended to all whom He should redeem by His blood, to every creature possessing a rational soul who should exist until time is no more, and therefore, He said to those who were to be the first to carry out His commission when He was no longer visibly upon the earth, "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. Going therefore, teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." To teach men the way of salvation was to offer them the means of sharing in the fruits of the Passion of Christ.

We are saved by the blood of Christ, nothing else can save us, yet He says to the Apostles, "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned." They were not merely

to teach the *fact*, but to lay down the *conditions* by fulfilment of which the benefits of the fact were to be ours.

So first some one comes to teach us, and without the teaching we cannot believe, for no one can believe what is not in some way proposed to him to believe, and upon our acceptance of that teaching, and the regulation of our lives in accordance with it, depends our salvation or damnation. It seems plain that the use of the Passion of Christ to the individual, depends upon his acceptance of the fact when it is taught him, and on his carrying out of the consequences of the fact when he knows them. The fact of Christ dying for us will not avail us, unless we receive the teaching of the fact and its obligations, from those whom He commissioned to teach the one and the other. These teachers were to be Christ's ambassadors, and for their efficiency in their work He makes them sharers in His own authority. There is no ambiguity about the words of the divine commission, they could not be plainer. They exclude any possibility of dispute with regard to their meaning. To teach, that was their duty, and a teacher must be vested with authority if he is to have an effective hearing. Their mission was to preach not what

they chose, not what the people might choose, but what they were divinely authorised to teach. Their commission was as extraordinary as it was plain and unqualified. In its discharge there was not to be merely a similarity between what they taught and what He taught, but there was to be an identity. The voice that was then speaking to them and their voices that were to teach till the end of time were identical. We can only understand the full import of this if we reflect for a moment upon what would have been our mental attitude had we heard Him teaching when He was on earth. We are gathered round Him, perhaps on the shores of the lake, or upon the hillside. We believe Him to be God, infinite in knowledge and infinite in truthfulness. We follow Him because we believe Him to be our divine Teacher, we listen to Him with wonder and awe. Perhaps what He says is altogether opposed to our preconceived notions, perhaps we do not understand it, yet when He speaks we do not doubt Him; if we do we are lost. His authority is divine, and because of that our submission is absolute. It is not blind, or slavish, or unreasonable. Reason has gone before; she has decided that when the God of truth speaks in the

person of His Son, it would be opposed to reason not to believe. We should so behave if we had seen and heard Him in the flesh. Then what does He say which makes us Catholics take up the position of recognising the voice of the Church as His voice, and giving to it the same submission as we should have given to Him? "He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me, and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me" (Luke x. 16). So that the despising of the teaching of the duly authorised teacher, once we recognise the voice, is the despising of God.

Besides the assurance of the identity of voice, there is to be a communication of His powers to those who are to do His work by His authority. "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth" (Mark xxviii. 18), and in virtue of that power He sends them, even as His Father had sent Him. "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you" (John xx. 21). The Father had sent Him with power to teach, and this sending with power means sending Him with supreme authority. So He sends them. As the Father had sent Him with all power, and therefore with the power of choosing them and constituting them the teaching body, so

He sends them, with power to choose others, and to consolidate and perpetuate the teaching body which He has now established, and that there might be no defectibility in that teaching body He makes the magnificent promise, "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20).

He was to be with them, not merely by a benign presence, but in their office as teachers, Himself actively teaching through them, so that till the end of time it was to be true, "He that heareth you heareth Me." It is evident from the words of Christ Himself that the teaching body through which He shall teach, was to last so long as there was any one to be taught, and as there are still those who need to be taught the conditions of salvation; as there are still living beings for whom Christ died on Calvary that they might be saved, that teaching body must be teaching now, and must never have ceased teaching since the day of Pentecost; and that living teaching body who speaks with His voice and with His authority is the Holy Catholic Church.

In narrowing down the subject of the authority of the Church to her authority in teaching, it must

not be thought that this is the only authority which belongs to the Church. She has received from Christ all His delegated power. In her teaching office she is His ambassador, holding His place on earth. But Christ had not only the power and authority to teach, which is called the prophetical power, He had regal power as King of kings, and sacerdotal power as great high Priest. All these three powers He bestowed upon His Church, and by virtue of them she has the power to govern or rule; she has the power of the sacred ministry, which she imparts for the perpetuity of her Sacrifice and for the administration of her Sacraments; and she has the power of teaching, which is threefold, inasmuch as she is the witness of the real truth, the actual imparter or authorised teacher of revealed truth, and she is the supreme judge on questions or disputes which arise concerning the revealed truth and its consequences.

We shall limit ourselves to the consideration of her office as the authorised spiritual teacher and judge, supreme and final, in all matters which come within these limits. No one, realising the important consequences which follow directly from the main fact, if it can be established, can fail to under-

stand the grave responsibility which is inseparable from it. We must boldly face those consequences if we would live with a peaceful, upright conscience. It is a stupendous thing to believe that God is teaching to-day on the earth, teaching with a recognisable voice, teaching through a visible body, teaching not obscurely, but from the house tops, so that those who have ears may hear. And it is a solemn thought which forces itself upon all that His divine voice is speaking, and that it is possible, in the confusion of tongues and in the noise of the world, in the storm of passion and prejudice and pride, His voice may be unheard or unheeded, and that those who wilfully disregard it shall perish eternally.

The apostolic teachers themselves declared their authority as ambassadors of Christ. St. Paul speaks of Christ "by Whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith in all nations for His name" (Rom. i. 5). He seems to have answered an objection which is heard even in these days. There would appear to be no need of a teaching Church, for we read in St. Paul's epistles, who quotes from the prophet Joel in the Old Testament, "For whomsoever shall call upon

the name of the Lord shall be saved." "Yes," says St. Paul, "but how then shall they call on Him in Whom they have not believed? Or how shall they believe Him of Whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they be sent?" (Rom. x. 13–15). St. Paul says distinctly, "Christ sent me . . . to preach the Gospel" (1 Cor. i. 17). He speaks of himself and his brother Apostles as "ministers of Christ," "Who hath made us fit ministers." "For Christ, therefore, we are ambassadors." He speaks of "the Gospel which has been committed to my trust," and because he has received this trust and this authority, he calls upon them to give their faith and obedience to his teaching, and to "avoid them that make dissensions."

He must have been speaking of possible opposition or want of submission to his teaching authority, when he said that the weapons of the warfare he was engaged in were not carnal, but mighty to God, unto the pulling down of fortifications, destroying counsels. He seems to refer to the pride of man's intellect in not accepting a teacher, when he speaks of the house which exalteth itself against the knowledge of God. By the power of

the authority which he had received, he must bring into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ. No one could bring others into obedience, unless he held authority to do so. Disobedience was not to be tolerated, because it outraged commission of authority received. He was teaching the truth which he had received from Christ. "I have received from the Lord," he says, "that which I also delivered to you," and the claim for acceptance rested upon the fact that what he delivered, he had received to deliver. There was no liberty allowed in regard to the authority of the first teachers of Christ's truth in matters which they taught. St. Paul allows no private judgment to his Corinthian converts. He reminded them of the Gospel which he had preached, which they had received, and wherein they stood; and by this, he adds, "you are saved, if you hold fast after what manner I preached to you, unless you have believed in vain" (1 Cor. xv. 1, 2). He appeals to nothing, save the authority with which he first preached or taught, and their eternal salvation depended upon their standing by that. These are the testimonies of the sacred Scriptures themselves as to the method pursued by the great Apostle of the Gentiles. We

might take as a summary of his method of work in the whole of his apostolic career, that which is said of him in the Acts of the Apostles with regard to a particular portion: "He went through Syria and Silesia confirming the Churches, commanding them to keep the precepts of the Apostles and the ancients" (Acts xv. 41). Those only who have authority can rightfully command, and if the Apostle commands, it is because he has been endowed with power from on high.

We hear to-day an outcry among some in this country against all dogmatic teaching. Logically they must object also to apostolic teaching, which was nothing if not dogmatic. A dogma is a doctrine taught or laid down with authority, and the apostolic doctrine was such beyond dispute: "Ye men of Judea, and all you that dwell in Jerusalem, be this known to you, and with your ears receive my words." This was the tone adopted by St. Peter when he went forth with consciousness of his power to preach in the streets of Jerusalem. This is my message, I come not to dispute with you, I come to teach, so with your ears receive my words. Perhaps some who object to dogmatic teaching, would consider this rather

dogmatic of St. Peter. So it was. One characteristic of the Apostles' preaching we certainly know. It may have been eloquent, it may have been simple, but it was "with great power," that is, with great authority, as their Master's was before them, forcing the unwilling admission that He taught as one having power. As the Apostles taught in the beginning, so must the Church of God teach to-day. She has her charter, by that she stands, and that charter is emblazoned with the words, "Go and teach," and that with divine authority.

No Christian denies that without faith salvation is impossible, and the very nature of faith requires a teacher. Faith comes by hearing. Not merely by physical hearing, but by what may be called mind hearing, by submission of the intellect and the will to the word of God. This must be made known to us by duly authorised teachers, for "how can they preach, unless they be sent?" The only alternative is, that God should make a direct and particular revelation to each individual. There is not, however, a vestige of evidence that this is the case in the present order, whereas there is abundant evidence of the provision by God of a duly commissioned Teacher, and by the same act

wherewith He authorised and commissioned that Teacher to go forth with His authority, He placed upon all nations, upon every creature, the obligation of hearing, and of obeying the voice, which is, in fact, His own.

In the ordinary method of divine providence there is no way of attaining to the truth, or of having faith, and so of saving our soul, except by obedience to authority. We, as Catholics, believe that this method was established by our Lord and Saviour, Who intended it to hold good so long as His religion should last. How could the perpetuity of the faith have been provided for, if that ordinance of teaching which, during His lifetime and during that of His Apostles, was judged necessary, had been thus suspended when it began to be most wanted? Difficulties with regard to belief were not likely to diminish as time went on, and for this the followers of Christ were to be prepared. He warned them Himself, and His warning is repeated by His Apostles. "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets." How were they to be discerned? Was no one to point them out? Were we to be left at the mercy of our own unstable and incompetent judgment? We hear St. Paul telling

the Corinthians: "For there must also be heresies" (1 Cor. xi. 19), that is, some choosing for themselves in opposition to authority. Then to whom were they to look who would avoid heresy? But listen to his writing to Timothy: "There shall come a time when they will not endure sound doctrine" (that is, when they will object to all dogmatic teaching), "but according to their own desires they will heap to themselves teachers having itching ears." St. Paul might have had a foresight of what is happening in this land to-day. Because of these things which were prophesied to happen, Christ must have constituted some supreme judge if He wished His Church to endure for all time, for His Church must perish so soon as there ceased to be unity of faith amongst its members, and this unity could not last—such is the perversity of man—unless there had been a supreme judge exercising absolute authority by virtue of a divine commission, and as the final court of appeal deciding "this is the faith committed to the Church, accept it if you would be a Christian, or reject it at your peril."

Again, man is disposed, we may say naturally, to question truths which are not self-evident in the natural or physical order. How much more

so when the truths are of the supernatural order? There are difficulties and obscurities in the sacred Scripture itself, difficulties in matters of faith, which no learning could dispose of effectually. This is apparent from the history of dogmatic truths themselves. The most learned, and the most holy men were found ranged on opposite sides in most important matters touching the undefined faith. They might have continued arguing and disputing till the crack of doom, had there been no supreme judge. The members of the Church might be torn this way and that, being unable to know, since there seems so much learning and so much piety on either side. But the Church came in and authoritatively lifted up her voice, and there was an end to disputes. Her children recognised in her voice the voice of God, and when that was heard all questioning ceased.

Probably none would deny that there must be a final and supreme authority in matters of faith; when, however, the question arises where that authority rests, there is a great divergence of belief. Catholics hold that it is not any private individual, because there could be no finality for the body; it cannot be the whole Christian people, for nowhere

in the Holy Scripture is there found a commission to teach, or to decide, given to them; neither can it be a mere civil prince, for he may be an infidel, a heretic, or a schismatic, and no civil prince commands the obedience of the world. Where, then, is this authority? It is the teaching Church, teaching in her ordinary method of teaching, or teaching by the decrees and definitions of her supreme head, the infallible Pope of Rome, acting as Christ's vicar and as successor of St. Peter. Granted that the Church was instituted as a society, and that is patent upon the face of the New Testament, some ultimate court of appeal, some tribunal which is final must belong to her, as it belongs to every other society. A written law governing the society may exist, but as there may be different interpretations of the law, vitally affecting the society or individuals, there must be some final court of appeal, which may definitely decide the interpretation and the application of the law. We see this plainly in civil life. A dispute arises, a lawsuit follows, the case is argued out, a decision is given, say, at the King's Bench. One of the parties is dissatisfied; an appeal follows. The judges of the appeal give their decision. Still the parties are

not satisfied. Then comes the appeal to the House of Lords, whose judgment is absolute and final. The case is ended.

The history of the exercise of this economy, of this power of practical, final and irrevocable judgment in matters of faith and morals, and in matters affecting them, is the history of the Church during the lifetime of the Apostles, and then on through the centuries, from the first general Council of Nice in the fourth century, down to the Council of the Vatican in the nineteenth. What had become of the practical belief in the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ, the doctrine upon which the whole of Christianity depends for its reasonableness, its warrant, and its efficaciousness, had not the Church exercised her authority and condemned Arius and his followers? And similarly with other great and fundamental truths of Christianity. If the Church had not been endowed with this power, she would have had within her the elements of dissolution, and Christianity had long ago been scattered to the winds and become a by-word among the nations.

Under the providence of God, the authority of the Church has saved Christianity, and Christianity must fail so soon as authority shall cease to be an

integral and an essential part of it. This is a very solemn and a very serious consideration for any man who is not quite sure that such an authority is claimed, and is exercised, and is acknowledged to belong to the body or Church to which he belongs. Is there such a body or Church in this country? Is it what is known as the Church of England, whether high, low, broad or medium? She does not claim to be the supreme authority in faith or morals or in things affecting them, for it is evident that such a claim would be made in the face of facts which are known to the contrary and in which she acquiesces. She does not exercise it, for though she is more than three hundred years old, we hear of no definite dogmatic teaching, submission to which is essential to continuance as a member of her body. One may practically deny the divinity of Christ, and other fundamental doctrines of Christianity; and she has no power to exclude such an one from her communion. Yet there must be such authority in the Church of God. Disputes have arisen, and must arise, in any living body of men composing a society. One did arise, as we know, very early in the Church's life. Were the Gentile converts obliged to observe the ceremonial

law of Moses, or were they not? Here was a practical question affecting doctrine; here was a crisis. It called forth the first ecclesiastical conference, held in Jerusalem and recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. The scene of the dispute is Antioch. St. Paul and St. Barnabas go up to Jerusalem from Antioch on behalf of the Christians there. A council is held. St. Peter is there, and pronounces his judgment. St. Paul and St. Barnabas also speak, giving their missionary experiences. Then St. James, as the local bishop, expresses his own opinion, and pronounces a conclusion in accordance with it. Finally, a judgment is taken, the matter is finished, and authority expresses itself in these remarkable words: "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." Then the judgment is executed, the disputants are told the result by those deputed to convey it, and we read that, "They rejoiced for the consolation" which a final decision of recognised authority gave them.

Now let us suppose for a moment, that something similar should occur in what is known as the Established Church in this land. Some one, perhaps of a literary turn, with his devoted fol-

lowers, fired with zeal for the purity of doctrine and practice in the Church of England, and not unwilling to gain notoriety as a champion of orthodoxy, represents to the accredited authorities of that Church, that some practices most intimately affecting faith are observed in the Church, contrary to the avowed doctrines and articles of that Church. The authorities hear him, perhaps in the person of one of the local bishops, who replies very properly, that the matter brought before him is one of the greatest importance as affecting not only the welfare of the Church, but the very existence of society; he concludes, however, by observing that, really these are matters of no importance, and if people do not like them the remedy is simple, they can go elsewhere. Well, suppose the matter is pursued, the Metropolitan is appealed to. Now surely we are approaching finality, authority has been invoked. The answer is, perhaps, more unsatisfactory than before; really nothing can be done; perhaps it is all very wrong, some bishops say that it is, they may be right, but the best course is, perhaps, to do nothing. Perhaps our literary apostle, dissatisfied with this—as he might very well be—appeals to the ecclesiastical courts. If

here he were defeated, there still remains a court of appeal, the Privy Council, and this shall decide matters of faith and morals and discipline, because, presumably, of its peculiar adaptability to do so, seeing that it is a civil power, representing the Sovereign. But we have already seen that no civil prince can be the teaching and judging authority in the Church of God, therefore in the Church of England there is no such authority. What would happen should such a dispute arise in the Catholic Church? Procedure would be entirely different, and the result would be a fixed, definite and final decision from the teaching Church, discharging, as she has ever discharged, her divine office; teaching of all nations, speaking with the authority of her Founder, Who is with her, Who can never have left her, or His word had failed; if that fails, He who uttered it was not God, and that He is God must be the very foundation of our Christianity. Divine authority, therefore, in the Church of God is of the very essence of her existence.

DO CATHOLICS WORSHIP ANGELS AND SAINTS?

(Kensington Town Hall)

We are often asked by non-Catholic friends to give a definite answer, "yes," or "no," to a question addressed to us. Sometimes this is possible, but not always. Such a question may signify two different things, and may admit of both answers, according to the sense in which it is understood. The question is said to be ambiguous, and, to be correct, the answer must be a qualified one. It is not the less a straightforward answer; as straightforward as the nature of the question will allow. Perhaps you would allow me to attempt an illustration. A friend of mine from Paris asks me the question, "Do London policemen swear?" Now it is obvious that this can be understood in more than one sense. If I answer straight off, "yes," or "no," I may be giving a wrong answer. To swear means, in its strict sense, to take an oath,

say, in a court of justice, and it is clear that the London policemen may often be obliged to do that. So if my friend means that, my answer is "yes." To swear also means, among a large class of people, to use unbecoming words, bad words, and if that is my friend's meaning, I have a sufficiently high opinion of the London police to answer, "No, they do not swear." So to the same question, differently understood, the answers "yes" and "no" may be given, and must be given, if the question is ambiguous.

The subject of the present lecture appears under the form of a question, which, differently understood, must receive different answers. It is an ambiguous question, and its ambiguity arises from the fact that the word worship may be understood in two very different senses. In one sense, the answer would be, "Yes, Catholics do worship Angels and Saints;" and in another sense, the answer would be, "No, certainly not; Catholics do not worship Angels and Saints."

We must dwell for a few moments on the word worship, for upon understanding it properly depends the correct estimate of the Catholic position. Worship is short for "worthship," an Anglo-

Saxon word, *weordhscipe*, meaning worthy of respect, or honour.

Shakespeare uses it in this sense in *Richard III*: "That good man of worship, Anthony Woodville," and in other places.

In the Protestant version of the Gospels, our Lord is made to say: "Then shalt thou have worship in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee" (Luke xiv. 10). Here again, evidently honour or esteem or respect is signified. As a verb, "to worship" means to pay honour to, to treat or regard with reverence or respect or admiration, and this is the sense in which it is used in the marriage service in the Protestant and also in the Catholic Church: "With my body I thee worship." One would think that there could be no misunderstanding of the word when so used, and yet on the testimony of Dr. Trench, late Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, some do misunderstand the word worship when used in the marriage service. As nothing which I could say more clearly expresses the Catholic meaning when it is said that we worship Angels and Saints, I will venture to quote a few lines from a singularly beautiful work called *English Past and Present*,

by Dr. Trench. "A phrase," he says, "in one of our occasional services, 'with my body I thee worship,' has perplexed and sometimes offended those who were unacquainted with the early use of the word, and thus with the intention of the actual framers of that service. Clearly in our modern sense of worship this language would be inadmissible. But worship, or worthship, meant honour in our early English, and to worship meant to honour. This meaning of worship still very harmlessly survives in worshipful and worship, applied to the magistrate on the bench. So little was it restrained of old to the honour which man is bound to pay to God, that it is employed by Wycliffe to express the honour which God will render to His faithful servants and friends. Thus our Lord's declaration, "If any man serve Me, him will My Father honour," in Wycliffe's translation reads: "If any man serve Me, My Father shall worship him" (Lect. vii., Wycliffe's ed., 1380. St. John xii. v. 26).

It is clear then, that there is a sense in which the word worship means honour, respect or homage given to man, and by so doing giving to a man, or a creature, nothing more than is his

due. Even more; according to the old English Bible (ante-Reformation) God commanded children to worship their parents, and as we have seen, there is a sense in which it may be said with propriety, that God worships His creatures.

Now Catholics worship the Angels and Saints, in the sense in which the bridegroom says he worships the bride, or in which the child may worship the parent, namely, as one creature may worship another, or as God is said to worship His own creatures, that is, paying them honour and respect, reverencing and admiring them. The reasons for Catholics doing so, we shall presently see. Meanwhile, if by the word worship is meant that supreme unique honour which is due from creatures to God, and which cannot be paid to any creature without the crime of idolatry, then Catholics do not worship the Angels and Saints, and it is a wicked and shockingly calumnious charge to make against them. It is difficult to believe that any one in their senses, and realising the gravity of the charge, would venture upon it. No more hideous and hateful charge could be brought against any Christian body; when it is brought against what is unquestionably the oldest and the

most numerous Christian body, it seems so preposterous that it is difficult to believe any one could make it in good faith, that is, really believing it to be true.

Let me say as emphatically as I may, that it is impossible to find a single Catholic work upon the subject, from the records of Councils, to the little Catechism which we teach in our schools, where it is not expressly stated that it is sinful to pay to the highest Angel or Saint, even to the Virgin Mother of God herself, the same kind of honour or worship which we pay to God. For Him alone, supreme honour and worship are exclusively reserved. His worship stands by itself, unapproached and unapproachable by any other. He alone is the Lord and Creator, to Him alone is due supreme divine honour, praise and sacrifice.

The kind of worship which we pay to the Angels and Saints is an inferior worship or honour, and we have, as all reasonable men must admit, good and solid reasons for our conduct.

We honour them because God honours them. We cannot be wrong if we do what He does. He has honoured the Angels by making them His

Courtiers and His Messengers, by giving them most eminent gifts of grace and glory. As to the Saints, when they were on earth their lives were spent in honouring God, this made them Saints, and the Scripture gives us the promise of God: "Whosoever shall glorify Me, him will I glorify" (1 Kings ii. 30). God honours the Saints, so, too, do we. In doing so we obey the Scripture, for we are commanded to give honour to whom honour is due. In the Scripture we have frequent mention of the worship of Angels, and no rebuke is ever made by God to those who so honoured His messengers. We find Josue falling upon his face to the ground and worshipping an Angel (Josue v. 15), and several other instances. Moreover, the Scriptures speak of the Angels as our guardians, our tutors and governors (Ps. xc. 11, 12). They are represented as having an interest in what passes on earth; they rejoice when a sinner does penance (Luke xv. 7, 10). We must be careful not to despise one of these little ones, because their angels see the face of God in Heaven (Matt. xviii. 10), and presumably, would resent it. They offer the prayers of creatures on earth to God; they pray for them; and they guard and watch over

them. This is abundantly evident from many passages of the Holy Scriptures (Apoc. viii. 3, 4. Daniel, Tobias, Matt., etc., etc.).

When we speak of the Saints, we mean those who were once upon the earth, and are now reigning with God in heaven. They were the heroes and heroines of the Christian faith; many of them died for it; all of them were heroic in the practice of virtues which make man beloved of God. They have gone before us, but they have left behind them the example of their lives, wonderful in virtue. We are impelled by our very nature, to honour our departed heroes. Nations have their heroes, and succeeding generations propose them to their children as models to imitate. Shall the kingdom of Christ upon earth be the only one unmindful of her heroes? If we cherish and honour the memory of those who have lived and died for the honour and glory of their king and country, are we wrong to act similarly in regard to the Saints? Did they not live and die for a cause immeasurably higher, for the faith of Christ and for the triumph of the kingdom of God? Everything noblest in our instinct seems to demand an honoured memory of departed heroes. But there is something more.

Every Christian says, or at least should say, what is commonly known as the Apostles' Creed. "I believe in the communion of Saints," is a portion of it. What does it mean? Communication between members of a family or of a society implies an interchange of service and of honour. To deny the Catholic doctrine of the Communion of Saints, is to limit the possibility of mutual service and honour, to the members of Christ's Kingdom while on earth. But to do so is both unreasonable and unscriptural. Granted that the prayer of one Christian for another is allowable while we are on earth, what reason is there to suppose, that when a Christian has been admitted to the Kingdom of God in heaven, he is no longer able to do that, which all admit he could do, when on earth? If any one denies that we may pray for each other while on earth, he must never say the Lord's Prayer: "Give us our daily bread, forgive us our trespasses, lead us not into temptation, deliver us from evil," are all prayers for our neighbour as well as for ourselves. We become intercessors for others. "Pray for those who persecute you," was the command of Christ Himself, and if for our enemies, surely much more for our friends. We

do not believe that there is a great gulf between the members of the Kingdom of Christ upon earth and the members of that Kingdom in heaven. We believe that we are still united, for we are still members of the same family. Because we are Christians, we believe that we "are come to Mount Sion, and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the company of many thousands of angels, and to the Church of the first-born, who are written in the heavens, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect," as St. Paul told his Hebrew converts was their lot, now that they possessed the true religion of Christ (Heb. xii. 22, 23).

Though they now enjoy the visible presence of God, and being nearer to Him are presumably more powerful with Him, yet are they still of the same family, still members of the same body. Able to appreciate more perfectly the obligations of charity, we cannot believe that they are deprived of charity's highest prerogative when they have received its highest crown. We believe, according to the teaching of the Church, that they are able to assist their brothers and sisters who are still in the thick of the fight, and when we pray

to them we ask them to do so by their prayers to God for us. We do not address ourselves to them as the authors or disposers of grace or glory, we do not suppose that they have any power to help us independently of God's will and pleasure, but we ask them to join their prayers with ours, to kneel with us before God, as suppliants. This very fact shows the gulf which we place between our prayers to God and our prayers to the Saints. We know them to be entirely dependent upon Him, although we count upon their power, because of their favour with Him.

It is sometimes objected against the Catholic doctrine and practice of praying to the Saints, that it interferes with the Mediatorship of Christ, the Scripture saying that "there is one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim. ii. 5). But the objection arises from an altogether inadequate idea of what is meant by the mediatorship of Christ. Once that is known, and the Catholic Church teaches it clearly and distinctly, there remains no room for objection, because the two things are seen to be essentially different. If we say, using the word in a wide sense, that the Saints are our mediators with God, we mean nothing

more than if we were so to call our neighbours upon earth. They can only stand before God as fellow petitioners having the same nature as ourselves. But Christ is the One Mediator, in the strict sense, by reason of His essential constitution. As true Man, He is below God; as the Man Christ, He is above all creatures. He stands between God and man. He is connected with both, having the nature of both in one divine Person. His mediatorship is not delegated, it arises from His personal constitution; He is the only mediator of salvation, universal and perfect and absolute. The function of His mediatorship arises from His human nature, its efficacy from His divine nature and dignity. He is Mediator by strict, absolute, personal right.

So when non-Catholics suppose that the one mediatorship of Christ is interfered with or infringed upon by the mediatorship of the Saints, they put both upon a level, to the derogation of the mediatorship of Christ. Catholics never confound the two. They know that Christ is God, and that the highest Saint in heaven is only a creature. To the former belongs the mediatorship of salvation, to the latter that of intercession.

The office of intercession is perfectly well understood in every-day life. We want a situation, an appointment. One of the first things we think of is whose influence we can secure to obtain it. We call to mind our friends who may possess influence with those in whose hands the appointment rests. We call upon them, or write to them, saying we hope we may count upon their friendship to put in a good word for us. The greater the number we can get to intercede for us, the greater confidence have we of success. No one ever accuses us of supposing that our friends are able to give us the appointment. No one would misunderstand us, if we used more than ordinary strong language in our asking their help. "If you do not speak for me, I never shall get it," you might say, or, "My whole trust is in you, you are my only, or my chief, hope." If you said, "I know you can do this if you like, you are all-powerful: obtain what I want for me," no one would ever think that you were putting your friends on a level with the giver of the appointment; then neither do we, when we ask the Saints to obtain for us by their prayers that which we know God alone can give.

And here, perhaps, I might be allowed to allude to the difficulty, which some outside the Church experience in the language which is found in some approved books of Catholic devotion, directed towards the Blessed Virgin and the Saints. Before passing an unfavourable judgment upon Catholics on this account, it would be more fair to try and place oneself in their position, and seeing how they regard the Saints, to determine whether, under the circumstances, such language is not quite natural. Then again, those who use the language must be regarded as its most competent interpreters, and language used between two people who know each other and love each other well, might easily be mistaken by others for extravagance and exaggeration. All must allow that the language of love admits of an amiable amplitude which strict truth would not sanction. A mother will address to her child, epithets, which to all but her, seem exaggerated. She will call the child her angel, her queen, her beautiful one, her only treasure, and who will misunderstand her? The lover will tell his beloved that he worships her, that she is more precious than all the world to him; that the world holds nothing for him half so beautiful; that

he would die if he should lose her; and no one misunderstands him; it is the language of admiration and love. If our language towards the Saints of God seems to others who are outside, strange and extravagant, they must remember that it is the language of love. Sometimes we are confronted with the words of this or that Saint or writer of foreign nationality, and are asked whether such language is proper with regard to the Virgin Mary. In general it may be said that nothing which has appeared within the last four hundred years, approaches the language used in the same connection by early Fathers, both Latin and Greek. But we need not go abroad for such things, we have them in abundance in our own writers. Venerable Bede, "the Father of English historians," writing about the Blessed Virgin, uses language as strong, perhaps, as any writer in the Church. The grave Anglo-Saxon of the eighth century, Alcuin, poet, scholar, historian, founder of English schools, friend of the Emperor Charlemagne, speaks of the Blessed Virgin as "his sweet love, his honour, the great hope of his salvation, the Queen of Heaven, the fountain of life." The Anglo-Saxon poets sang her praise as the "Bride of the Lord of Heaven, the Ladye of the glory host."

And now happily we come to a point where even the most strenuously opposed to us will be found in agreement with us. Whatever may be thought of the honouring and invocating of Saints, however much it may be disapproved, there is irrefutable evidence that it was the belief and practice of the primitive Church. The Catholic Church of to-day finds herself in this matter, at least, one with the ages of unadulterated Christianity. No one could deny that those Christians who were forced into the bowels of the earth to exercise their Christianity, would be good witnesses of their own belief, and of the faith for which they were so frequently called upon to lay down their lives. Down in the Catacombs of Rome may be seen the testimonies of their belief. There they laid their dead, and recorded the name of the departed one, often invoking their prayers. On the slab which covered the body of one Sabbatius, we may read: "Sabbatius, sweet soul, pray and entreat for thy brethren and comrades." On another: "Atticus, thy spirit is in bliss, pray for thy parents." "Pray for us, because we know that thou art with Christ." And yet another: "Anatolinus made this monument to his well-deserving son, who lived seven years. May thy spirit rest well in God, and

pray thou for thy sister" (Dr. Rock's *Hierurgia*, vol. ii.). The language of the early Fathers bears testimony to the same belief and practice. St. Irenæus speaks of the Blessed Virgin as the advocate of her that had fallen. Origen writes: "I will fall down on my knees, and not presuming on account of my crimes to present my prayers to God, I will invoke all the Saints to my assistance. Oh, ye Saints of heaven, I beseech you with sorrow, full of sighs and tears, fall at the feet of the Lord of mercies for me a miserable sinner" (lib. xi. *De Job*). St. Cyprian writes: "May the charity of him who by divine favour shall first depart hence, still persevere before the Lord; may his prayers for our brethren and sisters not cease" (Epis. lvii.).

In every age testimony has been borne to the belief of the Christian Church, and it is interesting to recall that perhaps no country in the world gave more splendid testimony to the universal belief than this country of England. Her almost innumerable shrines to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints; her holy wells, her pilgrimages, her feast days, all pointed to the possession by the English people of the faith which proved the union between

them and the Catholics of the world. That our Anglo-Saxon forefathers were in perfect accord with us in this matter is abundantly evident. A little prayer which seems to have been in use in England many years ago, is an instance. This prayer may be seen in a Latin MS. of the eighth century, which is in the University library at Cambridge. Our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, addressing the "Holy Mother of God," say she is worthy of all praise, and call her the advocate for the sins of the whole world. They ask her to listen to them, to pray for them, to intercede for them, and they do so because they are confident as they say, that she can obtain all she wills from her Son, the Lord Jesus Christ, God Almighty. No need, perhaps, to recall the 25th of March, known even now as Lady Day, a day when all England honoured the feast of the Annunciation. By the laws of King Alfred, the Assumption of our Lady was observed as a national holiday. A law of King Ethelred II decreed: "Let all Mary feast tides be strictly honoured, first with fasting, and afterwards with feasting."

A whole lecture, indeed several lectures, would not be sufficient to treat of this one subject alone.

Who does not know that Michaelmas Day, September 29th, was the day for specially honouring St. Michael and all the Angels. All Hallows was the festival in honour of All Saints. The modern introduction of Bank Holidays is merely a restoration of the necessary relaxation from labour, which was supplied by the Church in these lands, by the festivals or holidays in honour of the Saints. There is nothing therefore un-English in the doctrine of the worship and invocation of Saints.

There remains but very little space in which to speak of the honour and respect which the Catholic Church shows, and always has shown, to the relics of her Saints. She holds their statues in veneration, she decorates their shrines, she commemorates their festival days. In doing so she regards them as sacred memorials of her departed heroes, as reminders of their virtues, as exhortations to their imitation; and in this she is entirely scriptural and in harmony with the universal practice of antiquity. She attributes to them of themselves no special efficacy, but she honours them because of their relation to those whom she believes to be most highly honoured by God.

To sum up; the Catholic doctrine as to the wor-

ship of the Angels and Saints, is, that they are worthy of honour as the servants and the special friends of God; that by the bond of the Communion of Saints they are bound to us in charity, and that they may be asked to exercise this charity towards us, by praying to God for us. By giving honour to them we in no way take from the honour which is due to God, and to Him alone, because the honours are not of the same order. By praying to them, we do not deny our complete and absolute dependence upon Him, and our full and perfect trust in Him. In one word, we believe that by honouring the Saints we honour God, through Whose goodness they have been made worthy of our honour, and that He is pleased to make use of them now, as He did of old, in the distribution of His blessings and His graces.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH THE MOTHER OF LEARNING[1]

(A lecture delivered at the Myddleton Hall, Islington, for the Islington Branch of the Catholic Federation)

It is a great pleasure to me to be able to comply with the request of the Islington Branch of the Catholic Federation, to address this meeting upon a subject which is closely related to one of the purposes for which that great Society was established, namely, the furtherance of those things which are of interest to us as Catholics and as citizens. As Catholics, we are profoundly interested in anything which relates to our grand old faith, and education is essentially related to it; as citizens, we are interested because, in the first place, we regard right education as one of the first qualifications to good citizenship, and, in the second, because we believe that when our fellow

[1] The author expresses his indebtedness in this lecture, to the learned writer of *Christian Schools and Scholars.*

citizens, who are not of our faith, know what the Catholic Church has done for education, they will understand how it is that Catholics can never tolerate education divorced from religion; and this will enlist, we believe, the sympathy and the justice which may be expected from all right-minded men, in our endeavours to secure for our children the inestimable benefit of a really Christian training. Catholics set as high an estimate upon secular knowledge as can be placed upon it by any; they have produced, and they are producing, results in secular education which are second to none; they claim the right to continue that work under equally fair terms as are given to those who do not value religious training as they do, and they claim this in the name of justice and equality, in the name of reason and of right.

What I shall have the honour of placing before you this evening will show, I hope, that they claim it by reason of the rich inheritance of labours for education, which the Catholic Church, their mother, has handed down to them.

It might be thought that in these days of enlightenment, it would be unnecessary to demonstrate that the Catholic Church is the great patroness and

the great mother of education. It is acknowledged for the most part by men of learning, but there is still much ignorant prejudice which blinds many, and which is fostered, I regret to say, by some who pose as leaders and teachers of the people. I read in a London newspaper some little time ago an article written upon a recent action of the Pope: "There is an attempt on the part of the Pope to exclude knowledge, and especially historical knowledge, from the clergy and the faithful." If this is true, and I say emphatically that it is false, then the twentieth century is witnessing a phenomenon which the nineteen preceding centuries never saw; if this is true, and I make no apology for saying a second time that it is entirely and absolutely false, the Pope is undermining the work of his greatest predecessors, who from Gregory the Great to Leo XIII encouraged knowledge and provided for its pursuit, because they knew that the Catholic Church had nothing to fear from true knowledge, and everything to gain by an intelligent investigation of historical facts. It is a sorry thing to say of Pius X, who has inaugurated the stupendous task of the revision of the Vulgate, that he is attempting to exclude knowledge from the clergy and the faithful. It is because historical evidence

is of the greatest importance, that I have attempted to treat the subject with which I have to deal, almost exclusively from the historical point of view.

In the days of the Apostles, the most renowned centre of learning in the known world was Alexandria. Three hundred years before the Christian era, one of Alexander's royal successors sought to make his name immortal by gathering a society of learned men around him, whose duty was to consist in studying and teaching every known science. This royal patronage was continued, and at the beginning of the Christian era the Museum or University of Ptolemy Sotor contained its library of 700,000 volumes, and was one of the wonders of the world. To this centre of learning, in the seventh year of the Emperor Nero and the sixtieth of the Christian era, came St. Mark the Evangelist, to carry out the command of the Founder of Christianity to "teach all nations." He gathered learned men about him, and founded the first Christian catechetical school. We might wonder what new element of knowledge a Christian teacher could bring to such a centre of learning as this. The literature of Greece and Rome was already there. The science of figures and numbers was there also,

for Egypt was their native soil, and even the Hebrew Scriptures, translated into Greek, were in the library of Ptolemy. To Alexandria St. Mark brought the Gospel, his own Gospel. He brought, moreover, the traditions of St. Peter and St. Paul, for he had studied under them both, and tradition has given the name of the Liturgy of St. Mark to that in use at Alexandria in early ages. He did more than this. He founded the rule of life by embracing which, men give themselves up to prayer and to learning, and to imparting that learning to others. And so to St. Mark, and through him to St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles, the first Pope, may be traced the foundation of Christian learning and Christian schools.

In course of time Origen, the son of a Christian martyr, became the great light of the Christian schools of Alexandria, and he taught the pagan converts, logic, physics, geometry, astronomy and poetry. At the beginning of the third century, notwithstanding that the two hundred years past had been years of persecution, every branch of human knowledge, so far as it had been cultivated at the time, found a place in the Christian schools, and even at this early date the schools of the

Church had reached a tolerably expansive growth. Carthage, Antioch, Jerusalem, Eddessa, had their schools, and Rome, though differing in her character of school, was beginning to be, under the care of the Popes, a centre of learning. Evidence of the care of the Church for learning may be found in the records of nearly all the early Councils, where regulations are drawn up for the furthering of learning, for clerics, for laymen, for the wealthy and for the poor. As the Apostolic work for Christianity became enlarged, so did the Christian schools, and we must follow in the footsteps of the Church's early missionaries, if we wish to follow the rise and progress of Christian learning.

To do this, in anything like a complete way, would be to spend weeks and years, not merely an hour, on the subject. I shall, I think, prove the claim made for the Catholic Church to be the mother of learning, and perhaps it may prove of greater interest if I confine my remarks principally to those countries which are best known to us, and which, as the lands of our birth, are best beloved. We may draw the same conclusions with regard to other countries, as we shall gather from our

review of Great Britain and Ireland, namely, that the world owes a debt to the Catholic Church in the empire of learning, which in general it is tardy in acknowledging and is sometimes even base enough to deny.

No one will complain if precedence is given to Ireland. She has been reproached for her ignorance, but no one can reproach her with seeking it. No one who has torn the loaf of bread from a man's mouth, may, with justice, blame him for being hungry. If you put out a man's eyes, do not reproach him with not seeing. The reproach was once impossible. Ireland fed to the full upon the bread of knowledge when the Catholic Church held it out to her; she was enlightened with learning before her eyes were blinded with tears and her heart was broken by oppression. If the Christian Apostle of no other land is known, St. Patrick is known with certainty as the Apostle of Ireland.

Church and Schools in Ireland

Disputes as to the birthplace of St. Patrick there may be, there are none as to the source whence he derived his education.

After his second captivity it is highly probable

that he spent some years under St. Martin of Tours, and that he also placed himself under the direction of St. Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre. He passed thence to the famous school of Lerins, and probably from there to Rome for eight years.

He therefore acquired his learning in the first schools then existing in Christendom, Tours, Auxerre, Lerins and Rome. It is certain that St. Germanus was his chief friend and master, and it is natural that the views and works of the master should be reflected in those of the disciple. The great aim of Germanus was to establish Church schools. He believed that there was nothing so useful for evangelising the heathen, and this aim was pursued by St. Patrick. He certainly took some learned clerics with him to Ireland, when he returned to it as its Apostle. As he baptised and instructed, he taught the Roman alphabet, the first step necessary for acquiring a knowledge of Latin. We may not conclude from this that previous to the arrival of St. Patrick the Irish possessed no knowledge of written characters, but it is clear that he considered it a necessary part of his pastoral office to diffuse among the people a knowledge of the learning of Rome, as well as of its

faith. Parents entrusted their sons to him for learning, his pupils numbered among them the sons of the Irish kings. He established travelling schools, and when he founded his monastery at Armagh, a school became part of the monastic establishment, and was taught by those who had got their learning from the same mother who gave them their faith, the Catholic and Roman Church. In process of time the number of students, both native and foreign, so increased at the University of Armagh, that it was divided into three parts, one of which was devoted entirely to Anglo-Saxon students who had found their way into Ireland in pursuit of learning. Grants were made by the Irish kings for its support, and during all the troublous time of the ninth and tenth centuries, when Ireland was overrun by the Danes, the succession of priest-professors remained unbroken. A disaster happened to Armagh in 1020, when its hospitals, cathedral, churches, and many houses of learning, with many books, were all consumed by fire, yet in the following century it renewed all its glory. From Armagh there was a rapid extension of monastic institutions, and simultaneously an extension of the cultivation of letters.

Within a hundred years of the death of St. Patrick, the Irish schools taught by the clergy had so increased, that the people of most parts of Europe sent their children there to be educated, and drew thence their teachers and their bishops. By the ninth century Armagh is said to have had 7,000 students, and the schools of Cashel, Dindaleathglass and Lismore vied with it in renown. Nowhere in the world was the multiplication of teaching centres so remarkable, and perhaps an explanation of this may be found in the fact, that the infant Church in Ireland was not, as elsewhere, watered with the blood of martyrs. The burning devotion which elsewhere accompanied the reception of the Faith, and found its expression in martyrdom, was directed towards deeds of sacrifice and love in the service of others, which service was considered to be most generously rendered by the imparting, free of charge, and often with maintenance and clothing included, of secular knowledge and learning which had come to them with religious faith. An association of two most precious things, which the children of Ireland will never suffer to be severed.

A mere enumeration of the scholastic establish-

ments of Ireland would occupy more time than I can devote to this part of my subject, but they cannot all be passed over. There was the monastic school founded by Enda, Prince of Orgiel, in the western island of Aran, where may yet be seen the rude stone church of the sixth century, within which lie the bodies of the 127 saints of Aran, and the remains of the small bee-hive houses which served as the abodes of the monks. Its foundation was probably about the year 480. It became the nursery of the greatest Irish teachers, and the resort of students from beyond the seas. Hither came St. Carthag, St. Kieran, and St. Brendan. Here St. Fursey spent many years before going forth to found his monasteries and schools in England and France. Hither came St. Columba to teach and to be taught, before undertaking his mission to North Britain.

A little later St. Finian founded his great School of Clonard. He was baptised by one of the immediate disciples of St. Patrick, and, after studying under various Irish masters, passed over to Britain. He returned to Ireland after some years, and founded his house of studies in the desert of Clonard in Westmeath. But the desert was soon

to be populated with scholars in thousands, among whom were St. Columb the founder of Iona, St. Kieran, and St. Brendan.

A school in those times was not arranged after the fashion of Eton or Rugby. The Catholic Church of that day, as the Catholic Church of to-day, knew no distinction between rich and poor, or prince or peasant, in her desire to impart knowledge, nor was labour for one any more than for the other. The scholars laboured, and under the rule of monastic masters this duty of labour was never spared, even to those of princely blood. The prince and peasant worked side by side at Clonard. Columba was of royal extraction, while Kieran was of humble birth, and they laboured and studied together.

Kieran, after spending years in Aran, founded two great monastic schools on the banks of the Shannon at a spot called Clonmacnois, or the Retreat of the sons of the Noble, and from this foundation spread a vast number of other religious houses, each one of which became a school. It is worthy of note that all the great masters of the Irish schools were followers of the most severe monastic discipline. The nurseries of science were

often enough the rude cave or forest hut of some holy hermit. There was Cluain-Ednech, or the Ivy Cave, situated at the foot of Mount Bladin in Queen's county, where Abbot Fintan ruled a community of monks whose lives were so austere as to elicit a remonstrance from the other solitaries of the neighbourhood. They lived on roots and herbs, and laboured in the fields, driving the plough and drawing it, refusing to use cattle for the purpose. Yet Abbot Fintan was a polished scholar, and was particularly noted for his skill as a logician. Learned men came in crowds to Ivy Cave to perfect themselves in sacred and profane science. One of Fintan's scholars, St. Comgall, founded the school and monastery of Banchor, near the Bay of Carrickfergus. He gathered round him monks and teachers, and the fame of the school reached even the great St. Bernard, who speaks, in his life of St. Malachi, of the swarm of Saints and learned men who came from Banchor, and spread themselves like an inundation in foreign lands.

The most famous scholar of this establishment was, probably, St. Columbanus, the founder of Luxeilse in Burgundy and Bobbio in Italy. Another Banchor scholar was Malua, who founded

at least one hundred monasteries and seats of learning, of which, perhaps, the most famous was Clonfert in Leinster. Another Clonfert in Connaught was founded by St. Brendan, and had thousands of scholars. To speak of the labours of St. Columba, or Columbanus, in the work of education, is to speak of the founder of the chief seat of learning, not only in Britain, but in the whole Western world. There, was the chief home of the classics, the mechanical arts, law, history and physic. There, husbandry and horticulture were improved, the monks made the ploughshares and other instruments of labour, and taught the people how to use them. There, were the seminaries of learning, in which sacred and profane studies were cultivated with equal success. The masters went forth on perilous journeys to gather knowledge and to bring it back to the people. To the labours of the student were added those of the scribe and the artisan. While they were listening to lectures on the Greek and Latin Fathers, hanging entranced over Homer and Virgil, or calculating eclipses, they were also busy writing and illuminating books, working gold and silver, and casting bells. Not only their own monasteries, but

those of every European country were enriched with their manuscripts, and the researches of modern bibliopholists are continually disinterring from German or Italian libraries, a Horace or an Ovid, or a sacred Codex, whose Irish glossary tells of the hand which traced its delicate letters.

The Irish scholars were remarkable for combining acuteness of the reasoning powers, with the gifts of the musician and the poet. There were no more accurate mathematicians and no keener logicians. They were the precursors of the mediæval schoolmen, and they were the first to apply the subtilties of Greek philosophy to Christian dogma. In the disputes which arose on the subject of the computation of the Easter time, they astonished their adversaries with their arithmetical science and their linguistic learning.

The last of the great Irish schools that I may allow myself to mention, are those of Lismore and Raithin. St. Carthag, who had been a swineherd, was their founder, and in Raithin alone he ruled 867 monks, who, while they lived on roots and herbs and supported themselves by manual labour, taught sacred and profane letters to scholars from all parts of Europe. Being expelled from Raithin

he migrated to Munster, and there founded Lismore, which means in Irish, the great city. And now with one word I must pass from this fascinating theme. This learning and teaching in Catholic Ireland was existing there, when for the most part, the rest of Europe was sunk in illiterate barbarism. In the cloisters of Armagh, Lismore, Clonard, and Clonmacnois were masters of philosophy and sacred science, and these were Catholic priests and monks, believing and practising the same faith and the same devotions as are now our privilege, united to the same centre of truth as ourselves, and acknowledging as we do the supremacy of power and jurisdiction of the successor of St. Peter, the Pope of Rome.

Early English Schools

St. Gregory the Great became Pope in A.D. 590. It was a time when the old Empire, with its letters and civilisation, was fast falling away. He beheld new races arising out of the dust of fallen empires. His labours for education in general may be understood in part by remembering that at this time Europe was in the hands of the barbarians. Cities were destroyed, fortresses dismantled, provinces depopulated. There was no one left even to till

the soil. Learning had fairly disappeared in the abyss of ignorance, and apart from a little learning in Rome, it was only in distant Ireland that intellectual culture had a place whereon to lay its head. To the Christian watchman on the seven hills of Rome, our eyes must turn for the sole hope of a return in Europe to the arts and sciences of civilised life. A new era of letters was to commence with St. Gregory, for the schools of Christian origin which existed before his time were fast becoming extinct, but again under him, heart, will, and understanding were to find their teacher in the Church of the living God. It is of interest to us to know that it was chiefly from the holy spark enkindled by him on English soil that the torch of science was relit. His favourite enterprise was the conversion of the Anglo-Saxon people. He must reach them with the teaching of the gospel, because only by its softening influence could he hope to prepare this savage people for the blessings of civilisation. If any of us claim to be Anglo-Saxons, we must put our racial pride in our pockets as we remember that ancient writers are unanimous in classing our ancestors among the most savage of the Northern tribes. But even as we

smother our pride, our thankfulness to the Roman Church must rise up on reflecting that, if we are anything else to-day, we owe it to the fostering care and educational labours of the Catholic Church. No country should be more ready than England to acknowledge the benefit received, for none has received more bountifully. The Church has been pre-eminently, with regard to England, the mother of learning.

In 597 came Pope Gregory's Roman mission. The title of Roman, or Italian mission, has been assigned to us in token of contempt by one who would not be content to be classed among the ignorant. It is an unconscious testimony that we are identical in faith with those who came, not only as the teachers of our religion, but as the founders of England's schools, and as the redeemers of her people from the slavery of barbarism and ignorance. We are proud of our mother.

Augustine, the former Prior of Gregory's Benedictine monastery, with a band of Roman monks, set out for the barbarous and unknown island. Gregory sent letters to the kings and the bishops of Gaul, to secure his mission a safe passage and hospitality. When they began to lose

heart and to fear the result of their encounter with the uncouth giants, whom they expected to meet, he sent them words of cheer, and reminded them that, if he could have had his wish, he would have led their party in person. He gave them all the riches he had to give, and sent them by the Abbot Melitus, sacred vessels, vestments, Church ornaments, holy relics, and "many books." Trinity College, Cambridge, preserves to this day a catalogue of the library brought by St. Augustine, and the catalogue closes with these words: "These are the foundation or beginning of the library of the whole English Church, A.D. 601." These were the books sent to us by a Pope to be the beginning of our national library, and from them St. Augustine and his companions began to teach the English. A monastery dedicated to SS. Peter and Paul was founded at Canterbury. Its name was afterwards changed to St. Augustine's, and here began the Apostolic and scholastic labours of the missionaries, under the immediate jurisdiction, let it be noted, of the Holy See. It was not until some years later that the School of Canterbury attained its full celebrity under the Abbot Adrian, but thirty years before his time it had become the

model of other seminaries founded in different parts of England. When Sigebert, King of the East Angles, who had been baptised and instructed in France, wished to set up a school for youth to be instructed in literature, he sent to Canterbury for his school-master, and obtained one in the person of the monk Felix, who became the Apostle of the East of England. At this time the liberal sciences are said to have been cultivated at Canterbury, and by some it is said that the school of Bishop Felix was the germ of Cambridge University.

Simultaneously with this work of education in the south and east, the monks of Iona were spreading the light of the faith, and the benefit of education in Northumbria. The name of St. Aidan is inseparably associated with the christianising and civilising of the north, and the Venerable Bede, who has been justly called the Father of English history, tells us that he began his work by the foundation of a seminary, or school.

In the wilds of Wiltshire a school arose round the cell of Maidulf, an Irish hermit who had settled there, drawn by the wild beauty of the place. Scholars from the neighbourhood supplied his bodily needs, and he gave them in return their

education in languages and literature and the sciences. Soon we find scholars of these schools from the north and south, setting out for Rome to bring home new learning. St. Wilfrid, afterward Archbishop of York, and St. Benet Biscop set out together, and on their return new centres of learning sprang up. Theodore, the seventh Archbishop of Canterbury, a great Greek scholar and skilled in all human and divine literature, was sent by Pope Vitalian. This learned ecclesiastic is called by Bede "the philosopher Theodore," and by William of Malmesbury, "a fountain of letters and a river of arts." Theodore had brought with him a large addition to the English library. Among his books were a copy of Homer, the works of Josephus, and the homilies of St. Chrysostom. Venerable Bede tells us that Theodore and Adrian were well read in all secular and sacred literature, that they gathered a crowd of disciples, and there daily flowed from them rivers of knowledge to water the hearts of their hearers, and that, together with the books of Holy Writ, they also taught the arts of ecclesiastical poetry, astronomy, and arithmetic.

Books began to multiply as journeys to Rome

became more frequent, and one of the most edifying sights of this period was the great monk and scholar, St. Benet Biscop, making five journeys to and from Rome, begging books for the youth of England, and coming home laden with his priceless treasures.

The Schools of Wearmouth, Jarrow, York, Canterbury, Beverley, Whitby, Lastingham, Lindisfarne and Croyland may be named fittingly to close this part of our subject. Any one of them would be sufficient to justify the claim that the Catholic Church is the mother of learning, and altogether they are an irrefutable testimony to the magnificence of her spirit and the munificence of her sacrifice, to secure for all within her reach the inestimable treasure of knowledge. Alas! that these peaceful abodes of learning should be destroyed. In 793 the Danes landed at Lindisfarne, slaughtered the monks, and set fire to their sanctuary and monastery.

In 794 Wearmouth and Jarrow shared a similar fate, and all the treasures of art and literature collected by St. Benet Biscop were destroyed. For seventy years these scenes of carnage and plunder went on without cessation in every part of England.

The finishing blow came in 867. The whole country between the Ouse and the Tyne was in flames. What had been cities and abbeys were standing ruins. Beverley, Ripon, Whitby, and Lastingham, all seats of learning and civilisation, were swept away by Holden, the Danish sea-king. Jarrow was burnt and Lindisfarne destroyed. For seven years the monks and the youths whom they were teaching, wandered about carrying the relics of St. Cuthbert, and what they could save of the sacred vessels and their precious books.

Other parts of England suffered equally. At Croyland the young children studying in the monastery were massacred, together with their teachers the monks; at Medehampstede, the Rome of the Northern world, as it was called, eighty-three monks were slaughtered, the Abbey was burnt, and its magnificent library perished in the fire, which lasted fourteen days.

By calamities such as these, extending over every part, England was plunged back again into barbarism, her seats of learning were all swept away, and for a hundred years a night of gloomy darkness settled over the land. It is interesting to note before taking leave of the schools of Anglo-

Saxon times, that parochial schools had their rise at this period. In addition to the Episcopal and Monastic schools, the education of the children of his parishioners was recognised as one of the chief duties of the parish priest. An old ecclesiastical law said: "Mass priests shall always have in their houses a school of learners, and if any good man will trust his little ones to them for lore" (learning), "they shall right gladly receive and kindly teach them. They shall not, however, for such learning, demand anything of the parents besides that which the latter may give of their own will." Here we have the origin of our parochial schools, which were evidently regarded as the priests' schools, as the seminaries were the schools of the bishops. Free education was given by the priests, by such as, if some of our more turbulent friends had their way, should be kept outside the schools! Had the Anglo-Saxons raised the same cry, and had they been able to effect it, they would have remained in the abyss of ignorance from which the Catholic Church, the mother of learning, rescued them.

There are claims made with regard to the antiquity of the schools of Cambridge, which carry

it back even beyond the Christian era as a seat of learning. What, however, is of interest to us is that without a doubt, like her sister Oxford, Cambridge also owes her existence as a University to the Catholic Church, the mother of learning. Although the account given by Peter of Blois may not be regarded as authentic beyond dispute, there are certain local facts which tell in its favour, and we may be allowed to use it as circumstantial testimony. Peter of Blois says that Joffird, Abbot of Croyland, sent to his Manor of Cottenham, near Cambridge, his fellow monk "Gislebert" (Gilbert), a professor of theology, with three other monks skilled in philosophy and other sciences. At Cambridge they hired a barn, taught the sciences, and were soon surrounded by so many students, that there was no house or barn or even church large enough to contain them. The monks, therefore, dispersed to different parts of the town. Brother Odo, who was eminent as a grammarian and a poet, taught grammar to the boys and younger students in the early morning. At one o'clock Brother Terricus, a most acute sophist, read the logic of Aristotle to those who were further advanced, and Brother William read lectures on

Tully's (Cicero's) rhetoric and Quintilian's Institutes. But Master Gilbert, being ignorant of the English, but very expert in the Latin and French languages, preached in the several churches to the people on Sundays and holidays. Peter of Blois continues: "From this little fountain, which hath swelled to a great river, we now behold the whole city of God made glad, and all England rendered fruitful by many doctors and teachers issuing from Cambridge after the likeness of the Holy Paradise." The period which is described here is the early part of the twelfth century, 1109. At the opening of the thirteenth century, England found herself possessed of two universities, the value of which was known at home and abroad, and beyond all doubt they were mothered by the Catholic Church, and fostered by her devotion and sacrifice in the cause of learning. The literary men of the England of that day were monks, and the pupils of monks. Such were the historians, William of Malmesbury, Florence of Worcester, Simeon of Durham, Roger Wendover, Matthew of Westminster, Eadmerg of Canterbury, and many more. The homes of learning were the monasteries and priories and schools, where not the gentle only

but the poor were taught by priests and friars, as at Evesham and Reading, St. Albans, Ramsey, Glastonbury, and many other places already mentioned. The catalogue of the library at Ramsey, which was the richest in the kingdom, may still be seen among the Cottonian MSS. and contains, beside sacred literature, the works of Aristotle, Plato, Sallust, Terence, Martial, Ovid, Horace, Virgil, and others.

We may dwell only for a short time upon the sister University of Oxford.

It would be an audacious thing even to pretend to give any authentic account of the rise of Oxford as a university. However far we go back in the history of Oxford, we are always referred to some earlier date. King Alfred allotted an eighth of his revenue to the support of her schools, and is popularly regarded as her founder. But even Alfred cannot claim to have done more than restore the schools which existed there long before his time, and the history of St. Frideswide carries us back to the eighth century, and tells us how in the reign of her father Didan, King of Mercia, certain inns were constructed in the vicinity of St. Mary's Church, which were used as places of

education, and grew into a religious house. This famous priory was the real nucleus of the university.

In 1049 Harold, then Earl of Oxford, placed Canons there; then came the Norman Conquest, and in the reign of Henry the Scholar, who had received his early education from the monks of Abingdon, the King handed the priory over to his favourite chaplain Guimond, who established there a community of Norman Canons and set about building. This was the first foundation stone of Oxford. Then Robert D'Oyley and his brother-in-arms, Robert D'Ivery, raised a church dedicated to St. George and caused it to be served by secular Canons. This was the second foundation stone. The nephew of D'Oyley, another Robert, transferred the foundation to his priory of Austin Canons at Osney, and so the two priories and the Church of St. George became great houses of study. The apartments in the Castle were made over to certain poor scholars, known as the "Wardens and Scholars of St. George within the Castle of Oxford." They formed the earliest collegiate establishment of the University, being governed by statutes, wherein mention is made of

a warden, fellows, scholars, and commoners. The warden was a priest, a Canon, and the Order and teaching were under his direction. Other inns and halls gradually gathered round these religious houses. No fewer than forty-two such were inhabited in Robert D'Oyley's time. As early as 1175 the Benedictines of Winchcombe Abbey had a general study house at Oxford for the use of their monks, and a great number of schools, presided over for the most part by the Religious gave their name to "School Street." To the thousands of native scholars were added those who, after the fashion of the times, resorted to Oxford from other countries. Professors came also from abroad, and one of the earliest of these was Robert Pulleyne from Paris, who opened his school at Oxford in 1133. Nine years afterwards he was summoned to Rome by Pope Innocent II, and, becoming Cardinal, obtained great privileges for the Oxford scholars. In 1149, when England was in the thick of the disturbances of Stephen's reign, Vacarius, a priest professor from Bologna, began to give lectures on civil law at Oxford; before the end of the century the study of canon law was added, and about the same time lectures on medicine began

to attract so much attention, that fears were expressed that this, being a profitable pursuit, might drive the other studies from the University. When in the reign of Henry II troubles arose on Church matters, which ended in adding the name of Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, to the list of the Church's martyrs, a great feeling of insecurity came upon Oxford University, and vast numbers of students passed over to the Paris University. In fact, the endeavour of the Crown to deprive the Church of her rights and privileges, was followed by the decay of learning, and although, perhaps, the whole reason may not be found in the tyranny of the secular power, still it was largely accountable for the decadence in learning which then came about.

In the reign of Henry III, better days dawned for the Church in England, and consequently for learning. The Mendicant Friars arrived and began to teach, and in 1229 a great immigration of students from Paris occurred, in consequence of a quarrel between the civil and the academic authorities there. Once more the University began to flourish, and some 30,000 are said to have been in residence as students. As is often the case in

any large assembly of men, there were some whose desire was not learning but mischief or worse, and there began those unseemly brawls and fights which have never been entirely absent from our chief seat of learning. One instance of unseemly behaviour may be cited, which shows at once the rough state of society, even in the city of letters, at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Cardinal Otho visited Oxford as legate of the Holy See in 1238. The University scholars sent him a present for his table, and called after dinner to pay their respects. The Cardinal's servant refused them admission, and more than probably gave them some forcible language, as he held the door against them. The students were good for a fight. The Cardinal's steward, angered by some uncomplimentary language used by the students, threw a bowl of dirty water upon the assailants. Though certainly not intended by the excitable Italian, the dirty water reached the face of a poor Friar, who was patiently waiting at the door for some broken victuals from the Cardinal's table. The students raised the cry "to arms," probably stung by the insult to the Friar, and one of them seized a bow and shot the steward dead on the spot. The

Cardinal Legate took refuge in the church tower, and, escaping by night, made for the King, and demanded justice. Thirty students were arrested, the city was laid under Interdict, and all the University exercises suspended. Ample satisfaction was made by the English bishops for the dishonour and outrage against the representative of the Pope, and peace was restored, the bishops being ready, as the author, Matthew Paris, says, "to make any sacrifice necessary to preserve the second school of the Church."

The gradual process by which form and order were evolved from the somewhat conflicting elements of which the society was composed, which could render this story possible, is the history of the University. All that I may say is, it was begun in a Catholic home in the village of Abingdon, under a mother who trained her children in the austere practices of ancient piety. Edmund Rich was steeped from childhood in the spirit of Catholic devotion. He assisted with his mother Mabel at the midnight office in the Abbey, he learnt the Psalter from her lips. At twelve he went to Oxford, and thence on to Paris. He studied also at Merton Abbey, then a great seat of learning.

When he took his University degree he opened a school of his own in the University town. He heard Mass daily, recited the divine office before beginning his daily lectures, and spent his slender income largely in erecting a chapel to our Lady, attached to St. Peter's Church. In a word, he led the life of a saint, but he was a saint who was also a scholar and a teacher, a close logician, and a great lover of mathematics. After some years, during which he devoted himself to sacred studies, he took his Doctor's degree, and once again began to teach. He had among his pupils St. Sewall, afterwards Archbishop of York, St. Richard of Chichester, Stephen Lexington and Robert Grosseteste, all of whom took part in the great intellectual movement shortly afterwards set on foot at Oxford by the Mendicant Friars. Teaching was his delight, but he became treasurer of Salisbury Cathedral, and in 1234 Archbishop of Canterbury. Like other primates, he knew the tyranny of the Plantagenet Kings. He was driven into exile and died out of his beloved England. But Oxford retained his inheritance. The work he had begun was carried on by those trained by him. Robert Grosseteste, at that time the most illustrious

doctor of the University, taught in the Franciscan schools. He became Chancellor of the University, and he induced Roger Bacon, the wonder of his age and the greatest natural philosopher who appeared in England before Newton, to enter the Order of the Friars. During his Chancellorship such men as John Willis, Alexander of Hales, Haymo of Faversham, several Benedictine monks, and more than one Augustinian Abbot, joined the ranks of the teaching Friars. The whole world was filled with the renown of Roger Bacon among the Franciscans, and if the sons of St. Francis were the teachers of England's great University, they were so with the other great religious Order, the Dominicans, some of whose greatest men and greatest Saints in England were amongst the professors of Oxford University. Several of the "houses," or colleges, at Oxford owe their institution to the religious establishments begun by the Benedictine monks, and they had a considerable share in promoting the extension of the collegiate system. Part of the grand and commodious building which was raised by a tax imposed by the monks themselves on all their monasteries in the province of Canterbury, remains in the modern

Worcester College. The monks founded and endowed their houses of study, and the scholars of Merton had the honour of having amongst their number the famous Duns Scotus, who after a brilliant career at the University entered the Franciscan Order, to return to Oxford once again under the doctors of his own Order, and to secure a fame greater than that of any English divine since the days of Bede. Here we must leave the most interesting subject of the English Universities, which, however, are magnificent monuments of the Catholic Church, and eloquent testimonies to her love of learning.

With regard to the foreign Universities I must be content to summarise them. Before the sixteenth century there were no less than sixty-six European Catholic universities of note. Italy had 17, Germany 14, France 12, Spain and Portugal 10, England 2, Hungary 3 and other countries 5. In the fourteenth century—before the change in religion—the University of Bologna numbered some 13,000 students, while the University of Oxford (including fellows, students, and tutors) formed a body of 30,000.

Whatever modern educationalists may think or

say in disparagement of the mediæval system of education, it is difficult to believe that institutions which turned out such eminent writers and thinkers as St. Bernard, Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, Alexander of Hales, Roger Bacon, and such geniuses as Dante, Petrarch, Chaucer, and Sir Thomas More, were inferior to our modern "cram" and high-pressure Universities with all their boasted progress.

I have alluded already to the provision made by the Church for the education of the poorer classes, but I want to emphasise that point in face of the calumny which will still be uttered, that the Church has always endeavoured to keep the masses in ignorance.

The one enemy the Catholic Church fears is ignorance. The one thing which can most effectually prevent her carrying out her divine mission is ignorance. Persecution she almost welcomes, she thrives on it; poverty makes her more like her Founder, and she loves it: but ignorance stands in her path like a forbidding monster, and her aim is to overcome it. Her Pontiffs, during her nearly twenty centuries of existence, have deserved the admiration, if not the gratitude, of all that is best in the intellectual

world, by their magnificent patronage of learning, and by their stupendous sacrifices to bring the inestimable boon of knowledge within the reach of all, simple or noble.

We have seen something of her Universities, and her great Public Schools, let us look at her for a moment providing for the poor and the lowly.

About the year 1400, the diocese of Prague alone, which covered a comparatively limited area, had at least 640 elementary schools. Now if we take this as a basis for the 63 dioceses into which Germany was then divided,—remember this was Catholic Germany before the rise of Luther and the Reformation,—we obtain more than 40,000 Catholic Schools in Germany alone,—all, be it noted, founded by the Catholic Church, and under her management. The same discipline and practice prevailed practically with regard to elementary schools throughout the Church, so we may make a similar approximate calculation for other countries.

From the beginning, the Church has educated the nations, and she continues to exercise this noble ministry wherever she enjoys her liberty.

She received her Charter from her divine Founder. She established the first schools in

Christendom, and gathered the élite of Christian genius to drink in the pure waters of learning at her fountains, she preserved the remnants of ancient civilisation from the destroying flames of barbaric invasion, and the fury of sectarian fanaticism. She has given birth to those great institutions of learning, which will be remembered in history as the cradles of genius, the seats of literature, and the home of the fine arts, when institutions of modern days will have been forgotten. From her bosom have gone forth the great teaching orders and congregations of both sexes, untrammelled by all earthly ties, to devote themselves, wholly and undividedly to the work of education. To-day, when her rights are threatened, and in some instances wrested from her, she still lifts up her voice to proclaim that education must be the directing of the will and of the affections; the moulding of character and the training of the highest faculties; the educating or drawing out of all that God has bestowed upon us of the highest and of the best. And when she is called upon to give up the religious training of the little ones committed to her care, she shows her divine charter, and says: "Non possumus," we cannot yield. She seems to

say: "Across my brow is written the words, 'The Catholic Church the Mother of Learning,' and till the day of doom I must discharge the duties, even if I have to bear the pangs, of that sublime maternity."

FOR THE LIBERTIES OF THE CHURCH

(St. Thomas of Canterbury, Fulham)

"*Render therefore to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's.*"—MATTHEW xxii. 21.

CONSIDERED merely as historical records apart altogether from their inspired character, the holy Gospels give evidence of the establishment by Jesus Christ of a society, or, as He called it, a kingdom, which differed from any which had previously existed. He constantly refers to it, describing its constitution and character, explaining its ends, and providing the means to attain them. In the Gospels is the record of the actual formation of the society by its Founder, and in the other writings which go to make up the New Testament, there is found evidence of that society, not now only as in course of formation, but in actual living being, manifesting all the essential qualities of a perfect society, and displaying the activity inseparable from a living organisation.

We, who receive the sacred Scriptures as the inspired Word of God upon the infallible authority of the Church, know that the kingdom or society thus established, meant much more than could be seen by mere physical sight. There were human members, human instruments, human methods, but the kingdom was not of this world nor from it, but distinct from and independent of it. It was as its divine Founder called it, the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of Heaven upon the earth. Its origin was immediately from the God made man, its powers were in accordance with its end, and that was supernatural.

It was not, and could not be, part of any other society. Nothing existed which could bring it into being, save only its divine Founder, and so soon as He formed it, it stood alone, by its very nature superior to all other societies actual or possible. It was complete in itself, supreme in its own sphere, possessing abundantly within itself the means by which the end for which it was established as a society was to be obtained. It was, therefore, a society perfect in itself, independent of any outside power. This society, or kingdom, is the Catholic Church. That she must be inde-

pendent of any outside or civil power, is evident as soon as her nature and work are understood.

The supernatural is above the natural, and therefore cannot be in subordination to it. The means must be suitable to the end, therefore human means, that are all human power could supply, are not adequate for the supernatural end for which the Church was established. She must be able to legislate for herself, for no society is possible which is not governed by laws. She must be free and untrammelled in the administration of those laws, and, in her sphere, her members must be subject to her and must be judged by her. She must be at liberty to receive into her society those who shall have complied with her laws, and she must have power to exclude from her society, any who shall be judged by her to have forfeited the rights of membership by refusal to obey. Whatever may be necessary for her to do, or to have, for the efficient pursuit of her end, that she must be free to do, and that she must have in peaceful possession. No civil power may lawfully interfere with her laws, nor free her subjects from obedience to those laws. Independence of all peoples, parliaments, courts, councils and kings, in

her spiritual sphere, must be of the very essence of her existence. This arises from the very nature of her being.

Moreover, in the sacred Scriptures we find abundant testimony that this was what Christ intended. The society was to be free and independent with regard to its head. Could anything more forcibly express the plenitude of perfect power conveyed than the words addressed to Simon Peter: "I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

"Whatsoever," is boundless in extent; power of the widest conceivable character is here promised, and is afterwards conferred. No civil, social or temporal power of whatsoever nature may lawfully impede his power, when he is binding or loosing with regard to those things which could have their ratification in heaven. The governing power of the society was to await the approval of no earthly power, and was to regard no disapproval; the divinely declared promise that heaven should approve and ratify whatsoever, in the discharge of

its office, should be approved and ratified by the Church on earth being all-sufficient. Again, we might listen to the divine Founder saying: "And I dispose to you, as the Father has disposed to Me, a kingdom." What was the character of the kingdom received from His Father by the incarnate Son? Not one with which earthly power could interfere, but a kingdom instituted by His divine power, governed by His authority, to be administered by delegates responsible to Him alone.

Such was the kingdom disposed to St. Peter and to the other Apostles by Jesus Christ. They were the rulers of this newly-founded kingdom, this Church; they must be free in all the exercises of their spiritual charge, subject to God only, and to Him alone responsible.

How the Apostles recognised their charge, is evident from their recorded acts. They asked no civil power for leave to preach, to baptise; they made laws, and judged, and when necessary inflicted penalties for transgressions. When they were brought up before the civil tribunal and were told to cease their preaching, they rejected the human authority, declaring that, upon which they were acting, to be of God. They made no

compromise, they affected no false toleration. They were comprehensive, but it was within the limit of what they had received, not made elastic for the caprice of men. They realised that they had inherited a kingdom, which by its very conception implied legislative and governing powers, together with supremacy in its own domain. Without this there could be no stability, no security. The kingdom which was disposed to them was to last for ever, destined to be the one ark of salvation for all. For these reasons the Church must be free, her independence can never be forfeited. She must be the champion of all true liberty, therefore she must herself be free. No laws of man may govern her in her spiritual sphere, for no man made her. No earthly power may hold her to obedience in spiritual things, for she owes allegiance in these to God alone.

It is not difficult to understand how a society thus constituted should at times come into conflict with the powers of the world. Not that there is any intrinsic reason in the two powers themselves that such conflict should arise. There need be no essential antagonism between them if relative positions are rigidly preserved, but it arises from the

greed for power, the ambition, the jealousy of the rulers of the world, and from the perversity of human pride, which is unwilling to brook constraint or to make itself amenable to salutary divine laws, when they clash with these human passions.

A conflict such as this arose in England in the twelfth century, and it added to the list of the Church's triumphant white-robed army, the name of Thomas à Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury, the glorious champion of right against might, the intrepid opposer of the royal oppressor, the martyr for the independence and liberties of the English Church. For these he died, knowing them to be an integral part of the economy of God's Church.

There was one power, and one only, which remained for King Henry II to crush; that power was the Church. She was the defender of the liberties of the people, the reprover of the wrong-doer, though he were the king upon the first throne of Europe. The Plantagenet would enslave the people and enslave the Church. England was Catholic and Roman to the backbone. Catholicity was stamped upon her life, and Rome was her mother. Not a bishop sat upon the episcopal

bench who held not his powers from the Holy See. The pallium, the emblem of unity with, and subordination to, the See of Rome, rested upon the shoulders of the Archbishops of York and of Canterbury. The authority of the Church was wielded by her chosen officers for the welfare of her children's souls, and in him who sat upon the throne of the Fisherman, they recognised the Vicar of Christ, the successor of St. Peter, the Father of all Christians, the final judge in all matters of the Church's right and the Church's government. Access to him was the sacred right of all the pastors of the Church and of all the sheep of the flock. Once cut off intercourse with him, and the Church becomes enslaved to the State. The State will exercise the external authority of the Church for its own temporal ends, and the tendency will be to enslave the intellect and the will of its subjects till it reduces them to a state bordering upon religious degradation. It was that the English people and the English Church might be spared this degradation that St. Thomas laid down his life. The civil power in the person of the King had gradually been encroaching upon the liberty of the Church. When, by the death of Theodore,

the primatial chair of Canterbury had become vacant, Henry saw, as he hoped, one who would aid him in his endeavours to enslave the Church. Never was monarch so vastly mistaken. He had been warned what he might expect from his sturdy chancellor if he became Primate of England: "You will soon hate me as you love me now, for you assume an authority in the affairs of the Church to which I will never assent." It was but too true. Thomas must raise his protest against the appropriation of the revenues of the Church by the royal power. He must defend the privileges which were secured to the clergy by the ecclesiastical and the civil law; these must suffer no encroachment. The power of the Church to cut off from her communion those who contumaciously disobeyed her laws must remain intact, and access to the final court of appeal, to the pastor and teacher of all the flock, must be secured to all without let or hindrance.

St. Thomas was the champion of the sacred rights which, as the chief of the Church in this land, were entrusted to his keeping. No displeasure of royal friend, no loss of favour, no suffering in his own person, or in the persons of those whom

he loved, must allow him to forfeit his sacred charge. For seven long years the struggle continues. For seven years Henry strives to break down the indomitable will of the Archbishop. Thomas stands almost alone in resistance. His the bitter pang, to see many of his episcopal brethren failing in their allegiance to God and to him, to give it to the Prince who would reward them with his favours. Once only during that seven years did the Saint falter. Approached by the weeping bishops, moved by the tears of his clergy, hoping that his people might be spared, and desirous, above all, that the unity of the Church might be maintained, he gave temporary consent to what are known as the Constitutions of Clarendon, which, had they prevailed, would have enslaved the English Church. It was a touch of human weakness such as Peter had when he denied his Master, but it was momentary only, and the Saint soon rose above the man, and made magnificent retractation. How he followed this momentary failing by self-imposed penances, how he abstained from the consolation of offering the holy Mass, how he sought absolution from the Pope, all these things are fully recorded.

What, in short, did the proposals of the King mean which St. Thomas resisted, even unto death? They meant an utter enslaving of the Church to the secular power. If they had been acceded to, the relations of the Church and State would have become very much what the lust and tyranny of Henry VIII made them in the sixteenth century.

St. Thomas stayed the protestantising of England for more than three hundred years. But nothing less than his life's blood was to defer the calamity. Angered by the Primate's refusal to absolve from canonical censure and excommunication the Archbishop of York and others, without due obedience and reparation on their part, the King uttered the fatal words of passion which were taken as a warrant for the death of the Archbishop.

How fearlessly St. Thomas met his murderers, how nobly in the very presence of death he refused to sacrifice one jot or one tittle of the Church's right, these things are in the historical records of the land. Called upon to renounce his right, without the King's permission, to inflict spiritual penalties upon those subject to him, he replied: "Freely to the King I surrender the concerns of the King, but never, under any circumstance, will I surrender

the things of God." Ringing in his ears were the words of our Lord: "Render, therefore, to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

Night was closing in upon the old Kentish town, the night of Tuesday, December 29, 1170. The intrepid archbishop stands before the rude and coarse knights, who are threatening their own spiritual Father. "In vain do you threaten me," he says; "if all the swords in England hung over my head, your terrors could not move me from observing justice to my God and obedience to our lord the Pope. You will find my soul as ready for martyrdom as your swords are for blows. Foot to foot will I stand with you in the battle of the Lord." They try to drag him forth from his cathedral church, but he stands firm; they must martyr him on the altar steps. "To God and to our blessed Lady, to St. Denis and the patron saints of this church, I commend myself and the Church's cause." The fatal blow was struck, and the defender of the rights and privileges and independence of the Church in this land had received the martyr's crown.

I have said that it was St. Thomas who stayed

the enslaving of the Church in this land for three hundred years. Protestantism, which arose in the sixteenth century, means the enslaving of the Church to the secular power. That Saint Thomas was regarded as the great champion of her independence, we may gather from the fact that his name was the first blotted out from the list of Saints in the calendar at the Reformation period. Nay more, the Saint was cited to a mock trial; his shrine, one of the most precious in Christendom, was despoiled of its riches; his sacred relics, after being burnt, were scattered to the winds. But once again the blood of the martyr became the seed of the Church. Long indeed did it lie buried, but the winter has passed, the spring again has come, the Church for which St. Thomas died is seen in all the land, and the prayers of millions, led by the Father of Christendom, are ascending before the throne of mercy, that yet once again she may reign in the hearts of our dear fellow countrymen, as the queen of true liberty, as the defender and teacher of divine truth, as the guardian and the mother of all the children of God.

ST. PETER AND ENGLAND

(Preached at St. Wilfrid's, York, on the occasion of the pilgrimage of the Guild of Our Lady of Ransom)

"*Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of Eternal life.*"—ST. JOHN vi. 69.

STANDING round the Divine Teacher in the Synagogue at Capharnaum, the multitude had heard the announcement of a mystery which was to crown the mystery of the Incarnation, and which was to be the centre round which the whole economy of the New Dispensation was to revolve. They heard with wondering, the contrast between their fathers, "who did eat manna in the desert and were dead," and those who should eat of the bread which He should give, and should not taste death for ever. His flesh was meat indeed, and His blood was drink indeed, they heard Him saying, and that unless they should eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, they should have no life in them. They had heard and had judged by the twilight of their own intelligence, that which

even the full light of heaven shall not perfectly reveal. Even some of His disciples had found this saying hard, and had asked: "Who can hear it?" And relying upon their own conclusions, many of His disciples went back and walked no more with Him. They would labour for the food which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto life everlasting, which the Son of Man would give them, they had no taste. It was then that Jesus said to the twelve: "Will you also go away?" And Simon Peter answered Him, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of Eternal life." Wonderful words at such a moment, wonderful words for all time! We do not know that the words of mystery were any more clear to Peter than to the rest, but clear or obscure, it was sufficient for him that they were the words of eternal life.

Faith, simple, strong, unquestioning, conclusive faith, this was the characteristic of the Prince of the Apostles. Of the many other occasions which furnish proof of this, you scarcely need that I remind you. The picture comes before us at once, of him standing at Cesarea Philippi making magnificent profession of the divinity of his Master.

Flesh and blood had not revealed it to him, but the Father Who is in heaven, that He Who was asking: "Whom do men say that I am?" was not John the Baptist, nor Moses, nor Elias, nor one of the prophets, but that He was the Christ, the Son of the living God. That is Peter, too, who at the bidding of the Master launches forth into the deep after a night of fruitless toil, and lets down the net for a draught. That is he, making solid the waves of the sea by his faith, and going to his Lord across the waters. Alas! the day came when, in a moment of rash confidence, Peter denied his Master, but this, if I may dare to say so, seems even the more to bring him near us, to endear him to us, for it makes him more akin to ourselves, and his figure of marvellous sorrowing for his fault is a picture we could ill afford to be without. Am I right, brethren, in concluding that you have already conjectured why I should speak of St. Peter as pre-eminently the Apostle of faith on an occasion such as the present? We are gathered to-day in this renowned city of York, in this city of illustrious archbishops, of great Saints, of valiant deeds, of heroic martyrs, of great and glorious memories; we are assembled here under the shadow of the

Minster, in this beautiful Church of Blessed Wilfrid, surrounded by all of high and holy rite which can raise us to God, with one thought in our minds, with one desire in our hearts, with one great absorbing hope in our souls, that by our prayerful presence, by our pious pilgrimage to sacred shrine and hallowed scene, we are going to obtain for our beloved country—famous once throughout Christendom for deeds of faith and for devotion to the Apostle of faith—an outpouring of the spirit of faith. "Send forth Thy Spirit and they shall be created, and Thou shalt renew the face of the earth." This must be the burden of our prayer to-day, that God may renew the face of our earth, renew dear England's faith, through the intercession of Our Lady of Ransom, of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, of Blessed Wilfrid and William, and of the white-robed throng of York's blessed martyrs. These martyrs poured forth their blood in defence of the prerogatives of Peter's See, and in them our confidence is placed, because they know the value of the faith for which they lived and to defend which they died.

It is difficult to realise, as we are nearing the close of the nineteenth century, that this country,

which many of us claim as the land of our birth, was once conspicuous among the nations for its attachment to the Chair of St. Peter as the centre of all authority, and to the Roman Pontiff, Peter's successor, as the supreme shepherd, teacher and father of the whole of Christ's flock. Torn and divided as England is to-day by religious uncertainty, by religious conflict, and by absence of religious authority, one can scarcely imagine that once this great nation was entirely Catholic. That faith was one and obedience was one. That one authoritative voice was acknowledged and obeyed, that one supreme and final tribunal was appealed to in matters of dispute, and that when Rome had spoken the cause was finished. From Rome came the faith, Roman priests and Roman bishops nursed the Church in her infancy in this land with a solicitude, a love and a devotion worthy of the first Apostles and worthy of their Master. Almost like fire upon the hills of heather spread the faith which St. Augustine planted on the shores of Kent. North, south, and west it spread, and the teaching of the faith was indissolubly accompanied with Peter's name, and with the lesson of obedience to Peter's office. Saxon and Norman, as well as

those whose home England was before Saxon or Norman came, prince and bishop, statesman and warrior, knight and squire, and merchant and citizen would dare a journey full of perils, over river and sea and mountain, to cast themselves at the feet of the Father of Christendom, to receive his benediction and to profess that their faith was the faith of Blessed Peter, and that they had come there to do homage, because where Peter was, there was the Church. The road from York to Rome was often trod by saintly feet, York's own St. William knew it well, and though it was watered by his tears, to him it was dearer than all, because it was the road of certainty and of divine truth. Wonderful indeed was the stream of national pilgrimages of the English people to the See of St. Peter, but not less so, were what I may call the domestic demonstrations of the same faith and the same intense devotion. The shrines dedicated to the Prince of the Apostles, were only exceeded in number and magnificence by those dedicated to the Immaculate Mother of God, and the land was not only conspicuous for its singular devotion to Mary, it was also so for its devotion to St. Peter. Not a country in Christendom exceeded our own in its

outward manifestation of inward faith. Nowhere were there churches more costly, nowhere more numerous. They stood in all the land, each one of them separately an argument, and all together an overwhelming evidence, that the faith of this land was the faith of Rome. They stood irrefutably declaring that what the living Apostle, who sat in Peter's Chair taught, was the faith and the practice of the people of this land. Monasteries and abbeys, cathedrals and minsters dedicated to St. Peter abounded in the country on all sides. Canterbury and York, Peterborough, Ely, and Lincoln, Exeter, and Gloucester, and Bath, Winchester, and Ripon are some of the best known. The venerable Abbey of Westminster was dedicated to St. Peter by his devout servant Edward, the Confessor King.

And what did all this mean? It meant so many magnificent testimonies that the nation owned the Roman Church as its mother, and acknowledged in the Roman Pontiff, Peter's successor, the supreme visible ruler of God's Church, from whose dispensing of the things of heaven flowed all power, and orders, and jurisdiction for the government of Christ's Kingdom upon earth. And this was the testimony of this land, not for a generation or a

century, but for more than a thousand years. Alas! that the powers of darkness could sully so fair a picture. A cloud began to gather over the land; a cloud at first no bigger than a man's hand, soon became a huge threatening mass. The thunder of disobedience and of proud defiance burst over the land; the destroying hurricane of heresy swept through the vineyard of the Lord, and those who withstood the onslaught were almost as the bunches of grapes left upon the vine after the vintage, or the ears of corn which escape the reaper's sickle. The material monuments of England's faith still remained, but the spirit had departed. Darkness covered the face of the land. The sanctuary lamp was extinguished, the Blessed Sacrament was driven from its stately homes, and once more Jesus was born in some lowly stable, some humble cottage or some secret hidden place, pursued once more by a new Herod, in peril from His own creatures for whom He deigned, in His new incarnation, to dwell among the children of men. Yonder in that majestic Minster began the Good Friday which never since has ceased, when the adorable Sacrifice, which had sanctified its very atmosphere, no longer was offered day by day for

the living and for the dead. The day of England's greatest sorrow was then. Peter's voice, if heard, was unheeded. High treason was the taint of him who should hold communication with the Vicar of Christ. The halter, the gibbet, and the block gave the martyr's crown to hundreds who would obey God rather than man. England was robbed of the faith, though a More, a Fisher, a Campion, a Margaret Clitheroe, and a host of others, men and women, priest and layman, learned and simple, poured out their life's blood in its defence. Thank God that martyr stream sank deep into England's soil, it nourished the faith planted by Peter's messengers, which faith, in all its fulness and with all its obligations, it is our blessed privilege to possess. But the very knowledge of its blessedness, makes us long that others of our well-loved fellow countrymen should possess it. And Peter's successor has bidden the whole world take up the cause by powerful and united prayer. The Guild of Our Lady of Ransom has the high honour of having anticipated the wishes of the Sovereign Pontiff by several years, and now from the highest authority on earth, the word has gone forth for universal prayer for the conversion of England.

The Guild of Our Lady of Ransom is comforted and rejoiced, and the zeal of its members increased.

In God's good time the harvest shall be gathered. Oh, that the millions of this land would recognise the necessity of true faith! Lord, to whom can they go, but to Thee and to Thy Church, for Thou hast the words of eternal life, and all things whatsoever Thou hast, Thou hast given unto her, and how shall they go, Lord! unless Thou Thyself draw them?

My brethren, if to-day we be worthy of our name, if our presence here is Catholic in spirit and in truth and in desire, though we may never rejoice in its full noontide splendour, it may be given to us to see the dawn of that day which shall give back England to God, to Our Lady and to Blessed Peter.

"And the Lord turning looked on Peter." Yes, brethren, and when the Lord shall have given her that converting look which He once vouchsafed to Blessed Peter, then shall England too weep bitterly for her denial, and her future love be greater and more enduring because once she fell.

ST. PATRICK, APOSTLE OF IRELAND

(St. Patrick's, Soho Square)

We are living in an age of wonders. The labours of modern research are bringing to our knowledge marvel after marvel, such as would have been considered in bygone days as beyond the most daring fancy flights of the young dreamer of dreams; such as for the old among us now, recall what in their childhood's days would have been reckoned among the dark and dangerous practices of witchcraft.

What would our grandfathers have thought, had they read upon the very clouds of heaven the announcement of some specific for the ills of the dwellers upon earth! How would they have reconciled with the then known forces of nature, the reproduction of the voice of one long since laid to rest, or the indefinitely reproduced presentments of living and moving scenes by the ever wonderful biograph! With what pardonable in-

credulity would they have listened to the statement that mind with mind may be united in active intelligible intercourse, though seas divide and mountains reign between, and that the only atmospheric medium is God's pure air. Not so much as the encircling belt of magic wire, along whose length—whether buried in ocean bed or piercing mountain vastness—the electric pulsations fly, bearing in ever pursuing succession the message of mind to mind, not even this does modern science require. Through the subtlety, or perhaps it should rather be said, the simplicity, of the atmospheric medium, is borne to-day the intangible though certain message of England to America, as to-morrow may be the message of Ireland to Japan. While, however, men wonder, and reasonably wonder, at the developments of modern science, and while they are mystified at the strides which are being made by the investigation and the revelation of what was formerly considered the occult, they scarcely pause to notice something which is truly more astonishing; which is not only inexplicable by natural laws, but which is even, in many phases of its character, opposed to them.

What is that power, or influence, which to-day,

as we are witnesses, and as our inmost consciousness testifies, is producing an effect, beside which the greatest revelations of modern scientific research pale almost to point of vanishing? London is united to Dublin, England with Ireland, and Ireland to the furthest regions of the earth by a bond in comparison with which the Atlantic cable is rude and clumsy, and the medium of Marconi's message is gross and palpable! Yet it is not less real, aye! it is more real, more powerful, touching and influencing and blending into one harmonious whole the millions of Ireland's children wherever their lot is cast.

Go out into the cities of the world to-day—for the sons and daughters of Ireland although unsurpassed, perhaps unequalled, in their love of fatherland by any nation on earth, are citizens of the world—go out and ask them what is making their hearts beat faster, what is drawing their memories to-day more especially to the green land of Erin, what is softening and soothing them in their toil, what, above all, is lifting their souls to God in prayerful and praiseful thanksgiving; and they will tell you: "This is the day of our Father, the day of Ireland's salvation, the blessed day, hallowed,

and cherished, and loved; the day of Ireland's Apostle and Ireland's love—St. Patrick's Day!"

Amid the snow-clad Himalayas, on the burning plains of India, in soft New Zealand, in sunny Australia, scattered over the vastness of beautiful Canada, on the wide prairies, and in the busy cities of mighty America; everywhere almost where foot of man has trod, there is the child of St. Patrick; and where he is, there is to-day the same naturally unaccountable joy and gratitude and thanksgiving, because it is Ireland's Saint's day.

Surely here is something to make men pause. The bare fact that it is the anniversary of one of the saints of God, whose name we find in the Church's calendar, will not account for this. Many Saints' days come and go without sending a thrill through the souls of millions of men. There must be something special which, on each 17th of March, causes this never-failing movement of enthusiasm, which has lasted for more than a decade of centuries, and is as living to-day as ever. My brethren, you know what this power is. There is no need to declare it. Assisting here this morning at what is the central and most sublime act of Catholic worship and Catholic faith, in full

union with, and in perfect obedience to, the Apostolic and Roman See, it is borne in upon us with overwhelming force that that power is our holy Faith, that supernatural gift which Blessed Patrick brought to the Irish people, and which, by God's mercy, through evil report and good report, through famine and pestilence, through persecutions, and prisons, and death, they have preserved inviolate, and have handed down as a precious heritage to their children. Yes, the "Faith" and "St. Patrick" are convertible terms; he who truly holds the one, must truly love the other, and he alone can truly reverence the one who firmly holds the other.

What a wonderful gift to Ireland has this faith been! So much a part of her present being does it seem, that it is almost impossible to imagine an Ireland which was not the Ireland of the Faith; almost impossible to think of an Ireland existing in Christian times which was not under the rule of Blessed Peter, which was not united to the source and centre of all jurisdiction and spiritual power.

Yet Christianity was already more than four centuries old, and Ireland was yet sleeping in the darkness of paganism, when God laid His hand

on the Christian youth Patrick, and marked him out as the messenger of light. Prayer and mortification and longing desire form the remote preparation, and when it is clear that an apostolic work is to be done, apostolic authority must be sought.

France and Italy are blessed by the passage of the saintly man, as he seeks the chair of the chief of the Apostles for his apostolic work. Here was Peter, and where Peter was, there was the Church, and though Peter spoke by the mouth of Celestine, Patrick knew that union with him meant union with Christ, and separation from him meant separation from Christ and from Christ's truth.

From the Chief Shepherd of the whole Fold, he must receive the pastoral staff, which shall commit a portion of Christ's flock to his care. Hallowed with the sacred chrism of the Episcopate, filled with an overmastering zeal for souls, and armed with all-conquering faith, Patrick, the erstwhile captive and keeper of sheep upon the hills of Antrim, but now the priest, the bishop and Apostle, stands again upon the soil of Ireland. O how beautiful upon the mountains of Erin were the feet of him who brought the good tidings of the faith; of him that preached the peace which comes of truth; that

preached salvation; that said to Ireland, as to a new Sion: "Behold! thy God shall reign!" And the gospel spread, and the practice of it, with a rapidity which has compelled the wonder, if not the admiration of the world, spread like devouring flames, and the food of the flames was the hearts of the Irish people. It spread from Antrim to Kerry, from Donegal to Wexford, and lit up the whole land in the glorious light of faith, without one drop of blood being spilt, without one tear of pain being demanded of her Apostle.

Ireland joyfully accepted the message of the Faith; she opened her ample arms and received the bearer of the message with joy, she built him a shrine in her heart, and rendered him the worship of her constant love, her profound gratitude, her unfailing devotion. The seed had fallen on good ground, it brought forth fruit a hundred-fold. Before the Church founded by St. Patrick was many years old, it became one of the centres of the Christian world for piety and for learning. Her priests and monks had at their feet, in the monastery halls and in the school-rooms, the seekers after knowledge in theology and in the practice of the higher spiritual life, from England and Scotland,

from France and from Italy. Her cloisters were the homes of sanctity and learning, and so prolific was she of children who were given to God in both, that she could give of her superabundance for the enlightening and sanctifying of peoples beyond her shores. Worthily, indeed, did Christendom bestow upon her the title of the "Isle of Saints and of Doctors." These were the days of Ireland's transfiguration, and her faith was her glory, but even in the days of her passion, when Tabor was changed for Calvary, even then, with the Lord's Cross heavy upon her shoulders, her faith stood firm. When under the destroying advance of the invading pagan, church and monastery, school and convent were razed to the ground, with the blood of Ireland's bravest and best flowing like rivers in defence of altar and home, whatever else went down, the standard of the faith was never lowered. For more than two hundred years the state of the Church in Ireland was not unlike that of the Church in the days of early persecution, it was one long agony, and not until the eleventh century, when Brian Boru, with crucifix in hand, smote the pagan a deadly blow on the field of Clontarf, not till then did she breathe a breath of religious freedom.

If for a moment we recall that other period of Ireland's suffering, when another power, also the enemy of her faith, strove with fire and sword to rob her of her inheritance of the faith, it is only that we may bless the name of the Lord, who through His mercy, by the intercession of His Blessed Mother, and through the prayers of St. Patrick brought her out of the ordeal, scarred, and bruised, and wounded, it is true, but with her treasure, her faith, intact.

Great is the mystery involved in this unceasing victory of the faith, but there is one point in it about which there is no mystery, which is as evident as the fact itself, and that is, that this faith, this sustaining, this ennobling, this victorious faith, has not been retained without labour, without suffering, without sacrifice. Your forefathers esteemed themselves blessed, in that they were accounted worthy to suffer for His name's sake. Labour to them was light, and poverty was dear, and even sorrow was sweet, if it brought them rest and peace of soul, wealth of truth, and joy of eternal life. The law for them must be the law for us. If you are to be to generations yet unborn, what those who have gone before you have been to you, faithful

transmitters of the heavenly gift of faith, it must be with striving, with self-sacrifice, with the Cross —yes, even with the Cross. But "in the Cross is salvation, in the Cross is life, in the Cross is protection from enemies, in the Cross is strength of mind, in the Cross is joy of spirit, in the Cross is height of virtue, in the Cross is perfection of sanctity."

St. Patrick's legacy to Ireland was the faith, with all its mysterious binding power, but that faith is inseparable from the Cross. If the shamrock is symbolic of the Blessed Trinity, it seems also to bear resemblance to the Cross. O bear it proudly, it is the emblem of your faith. Bear it stainlessly, it is the signal of your royalty. Bear it confidently, it is the standard of your certain victory.

Let the history of the days that are gone be the law of the present, and the children of Ireland will continue to be an honour to God, to their Blessed Mother, and to St. Patrick.

SAINT IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA

THE SOLDIER SAINT

(Farm Street)

"*From the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent bear it away.*"—St. Matthew xi. 12.

It was the blessed privilege of St. John, the precursor of the Messiah, to be the first of all the prophets of Juda that definitely and clearly pointed Him out as the Redeemer: "Behold the Lamb of God, behold Him who taketh away the sins of the world." This was towards the end of his preaching; but he had prepared his disciples for that important moment, by announcing a doctrine which fell strangely upon their ears, the doctrine of the necessity of penance. "Do penance for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

The kingdom of heaven! What visions of earthly glory and temporal triumph, had not those words called up before the eyes of the children of Abraham, during thousands of expectant years! How strangely they contrast with the words, "Do

penance." If the Jews recalled the words of Isaiah the Prophet: "Behold I send My angel before Thy face, who shall prepare the way before Thee," how perplexed they must have been when they realised that fulfilment had come in the person of one whose home was the desert, who was clothed with camel's hair, a leathern girdle about his loins, whose food was locusts and wild honey, and on whose lips was the cry: "Do penance."

This was the first preaching of the doctrine of violence, a doctrine ratified by our divine Lord when He declared that "From the days of John the Baptist until now, the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent bear it away." Heaven is for victors, and victors are those who have fought and conquered. Drawn up as an army in battle array, opposed to the children of God journeying through the desert of this world towards the Promised Land, are the enemies against whom the Christian must fight all the days of his life; the devil, the world, and the flesh. From the hour that the proud and rebellious Lucifer with his followers was cast forth from the kingdom of heaven, they have been seeking to join men with them in the cry against God their Creator, *Non serviam*, "I

will not serve." Their onslaughts are continual, their successes are many. Never are they wearied, never do they lay down their arms and give a moment's truce. And the fight against one spiritual enemy must be maintained in face of the seductive allurements of the world, and the corrupt inclinations of the flesh.

We might reasonably despair of bearing ourselves successfully in a combat where the odds are so fearfully against us, were it not that we have a power which is more than equal to the force opposed to us, a power not of earth, but of heaven, a power which the God of battles has put into our hands, and that is the power of supernatural grace. By God's grace we can overcome, we can do all things in Him who strengtheneth us. God by His grace is with us, and if God be with us who can be against us? If armies in camp should stand together against us, our hearts need not fail; if a battle should rise up against us, in this should we be confident.

This is what Holy Church wishes us to learn when she places before us the lives of the saints, and proposes them to us for our admiration and imitation. She shows us men and women with

senses, affections, passions as we have, doing violence to themselves by the grace of God, and bearing away as a result the kingdom of heaven—men and women in every stage and state of life, who fought and conquered with the selfsame enemies who are opposing us, in opposition to them. This was not done by the destruction of human nature, but by its subjection. Grace can lay hold of all the high aspirations and noble faculties we possess in the natural order; and if it does, it elevates and transforms and perfects them. It purifies and disciplines and reduces to their reasonable order every passion and every movement of our being. It enlarges our sphere of action by taking us beyond our own natural limits; and it immeasurably increases our power and possession of knowledge. It even lays hold of that in us which might lead to our ignominy and our shame, and converts it into a means for our glory. It does not destroy nature, it does not supplant it, but uses it as the foundation on which to build the edifice of lives which are human, only because they are the lives of men; for their actions are beyond the limit of nature's unaided strength.

This and much more than we can speak or know

is what grace did for the great Saint whose memory we are celebrating to-day with joy and thanksgiving, the story of whose life is one of the most wonderful in the history of the Church; whose deeds have been the inspiration and the model of so many thousands of her warriors; who have realised with him that the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent alone may bear it away. When under the first movements of grace Ignatius of Loyola heard the call of God, he understood the conditions under which alone obedience was possible. When he unfurled the standard of Jesus Christ beneath which he was to strive and gain the victory, he saw emblazoned upon it the words: "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me."

Self-denial, suppression of self, this was the violence demanded of him, for he must attack nature in her inmost stronghold. His mind, his heart and his will must first surrender. There was no lowering of his dignity as a rational creature, in placing upon the altar of sacrifice, to the God to whose greater glory he had now dedicated his life, his highest human possession—his intelligence; for the object of man's intelligence is

truth, and God is its author and bestower, thus he was only giving back what he had received; but for all that the sacrifice was not made without violence to self. Again, self suffered a huge defeat as he made immolation of his will to God, and self was all but conquered when the holocaust was completed, and the heart with all its affections and all its mighty powers of love was dedicated irrevocably to the love and service of God.

This was St. Ignatius's conversion to God; it involved his whole being. But so far the sacrifice has been confined to the inner tabernacle. There must be an external violence to self. The purpose and term of his resolution must be seen in outward acts. His military instincts must be redirected, his sword of steel, which he wielded as any valiant knight, may be hung up at the altar of Montserrat; but he must arm himself with the sword of the Spirit. He is still indeed a soldier, but the whole world is his battlefield, and when he has conquered himself, he must prepare to do violence for the souls of others. Look at him in the cave at Manresa, where he puts on a rough hair shirt and clothes himself with sackcloth. He is bringing his body into subjection by chastising

the flesh with rigorous fasts and painful penances. When exhausted nature compels repose, the bare ground is his couch, and a stone his pillow. And even when for the development of that great scheme which God had outlined for him, for his own sanctification and for that of millions yet unborn, he laid aside for a while the penances and mortifications of Manresa, he still clung close to their spirit and they dominated his life.

Perhaps it is incorrect to say he laid aside his penances. Was it no penance to a man of three and thirty years, highly strung by nature and sensitive of what is usually conceded to mature years, experience and distinction, to take his place among little boys on the forms of a grammar school to learn the rudiments of Latin. Was it not mortification to set himself to master the technicalities of philosophy and theology when his whole being was absorbed in the divine Being, the source and fountain head of all philosophy and the object of all theology? Nature must have asserted herself when mistakes and failures and halting recitation of tasks assigned, were witnessed by the thoughtless, unsympathetic, perhaps, mocking, jeering youths, who might despise this erstwhile man-of-arms, this

hero of a hundred battles, conquered by the intricacies of a Latin conjugation. There are blows which are harder to bear than mere physical ones; there are wounds which are more galling than those inflicted by the sword or the lance; blows to our intellectual pride, wounds to our vanity and self-love.

Then through those years of study, was there no temptation to impatience with the slowness of the progress? Here was a great soul aflame with zeal for the glory of God, consuming itself with the desire to make God known and loved and served, thirsting for the conversion of the millions who were in darkness and in the shadow of death, held back by the tyranny of a Latin grammar and the bondage of philosophical definitions. How great, amidst the noise and bustle of the school and the city, must have been the longings in the heart of Ignatius for the calm and silence of the hermit's cave. Had he not had peace and sweet contentment in the ecstasies of divine contemplation? Yes, but self was his last seeking, and these allurements were but opportunities for him to do violence to self, until he should obtain the mastery by reaching the last depths of self-abasement.

Perhaps it might be thought that this self-abasement would cease when he began to see his desires fulfilled, his society approved by the Sovereign Pontiff, its members already compassing the earth as missionaries and as teachers, and himself the revered father of a noble family, the trusted general of a conquering army, the spiritual guide and counsellor of men of vast attainments and eminent sanctity. Ah! if we think so, we know little of the science of the saints. As the saint rises in dignity, as his works for God enlarge and his responsibilities increase, so does his knowledge of self become more profound. The disproportion between the instrument employed by God and the works which are accomplished, brings home with greater force the power and perfections of God, and the imperfections and impotence of His servant.

And so when St. Ignatius had become first amongst all, he might be found acting as the servant of all, even discharging menial offices in the kitchen. Or go into the church of the Society in Rome and see the little children of the city being catechised and taught the recitation of their prayers, and the teacher is Ignatius, the General of a great Order approved by the Church, the inspirer of

heroic deeds of apostolic zeal, a leader and master of men. Italy, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Asia, Africa, South America and other lands were venerating his name and magnifying God for the works done by his sons. Saints were writing to him on their knees, kings and princes were petitioning him to send out more missionaries imbued with his spirit, while he is making himself the last and the least, the humblest and the most self-effacing of all those, who with him and under his guidance had formed the Society of Jesus.

That Society was to conquer by the same weapons which he had employed. Humility must be its foundation, because obedience which is of the very essence of religion, must be its superstructure, and the greater glory of God must be its crown. How great a master of the spiritual life, how skilled a soldier in the choice of weapons against the enemies of men's souls our Saint was, may be gathered from the estimate he places on perfect obedience. It was his ruling passion. His knowledge of humanity told him that the fiercest struggle man must wage is in the dominion of the will. We may renounce all and retain our own will; and we have renounced nothing. Obedience is the only virtue

in the exercise of which self is not to be feared. Humiliations and mortifications in themselves are not entirely without their risk. Self-deception is not impossible even with the discipline of a hair-shirt. But "the obedient man shall speak of victories." He runs no risks; in obedience he finds safety and peace and happiness. St. Jerome did not exaggerate when, speaking of obedience, he cried out: "O great and abundant happiness! O wonderful grace! For obedience is an epitome of all virtues, because it leads directly to Jesus Christ; and if we follow the way pointed out to us we shall soon be perfect men."

This St. Ignatius knew, and so he practised obedience himself to the degree of perfection; he fixed it as the corner-stone of his Society, and the ruling virtue in the lives of all those who were to bear its name. If the Society which St. Ignatius founded had not been called the Society of Jesus, it might have been called the Society of Obedience. It is perhaps precisely because this virtue of obedience has been, since its foundation, and is, the dominating characteristic of the society, that it has been the best hated of all the religious societies in the Church. The Society of Jesus so

emphatically condemns the spirit of revolt and independence which is rampant in the world, by declaring the necessity and exhibiting the practice of obedience, that the world in self-defence must hate it. It is so utterly opposed to the principle and practice of the world which seeks emancipation from the laws of God, of the Church, aye, and even of nature, that the world must of necessity hate it. It is so standing a rebuke to the selfishness, the injustice, the indulgence of the world; to the craving after false liberty; that the world, to justify itself, must hate it. But herein it has a special share in the beatitude promised by our Lord to those who should be hated for His name's sake. "Blessed are ye, when they shall persecute you and calumniate you, and say all things against you untruly for My name's sake, rejoice and be glad, for your reward is very great in heaven." The Society has been blessed, in that its members have carried the light of the gospel to the heathen and the savage, in that its preachers and teachers have illumined the world with all kinds of learning, so that even the world is forced to acknowledge its debt to it in science and learning; but in nothing is it more blessed than in this, wherein it has most

closely resembled Him whose name it bears, for it has always borne with Him, the cross of calumny, misunderstanding and shame. But this is the means to its end; for "in the Cross is salvation, in the Cross is life, in the Cross is protection from enemies; in the Cross is strength of mind, in the Cross is joy of spirit, in the Cross is height of virtue, in the Cross is perfection of sanctity." The possession of God and the eternal happiness of heaven is the reward of sanctity. The canonised saints are those whom the Church has declared to have practised sanctity in an heroic degree; and sanctity is inseparable from penance, obedience and self-contempt. It is the law of the new covenant, the practical interpretation of what is true from the days of John the Baptist until now, that "the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent bear it away."

ST. PHILIP NERI

A LOVER OF HIS BRETHREN

(*Brompton Oratory*)

"*This is a lover of his brethren, and of the people of Israel, this is he that prayeth much for the people and for all the Holy City.*—2 MACHABEES xv. 14.

WHEN the chosen people of God were striving to preserve the sanctity of the Sabbath and of God's Temple, which were threatened with desecration by their enemies, Judas Machabeus exhorted them to remember the help they had already received from heaven, and to hope for victory from the Almighty. He told them, moreover, of a heavenly vision which God had granted him, and their hearts were filled with joy and confidence. In the vision he saw Onias, who had been high priest, praying for the people of the Jews. After this there appeared another man, admirable for age and glory and environed with great beauty and majesty, and the high priest answering, said: "This is a lover of his brethren and of the people of Israel, this is he that prayeth much for the people and for all the Holy City, Jeremias, the prophet of God."

Whereupon Jeremias stretched forth his right hand, and gave to Judas a sword of gold, saying: "Take this holy sword a gift from God, wherewith thou shalt overthrow the adversaries of My people Israel."

The description given of the prophet: "Admirable for age and glory and environed with great beauty and majesty," . . . a lover of his brethren, who prayeth much for the people and for the Holy City—seems so suitable to describe your glorious patron St. Philip, whose feast you are so happily celebrating to-day, that it somewhat relieves the embarrassment necessarily attending the endeavour to speak something of the character, the works, and the wonders of the Saint's life, to those living under the shadow of his name, and having before their eyes, in the lives and ministry of his sons the best story of his life and the living fruits of his prayers. The description of the prophet might well stand for that of our Saint, admirable for age and glory and environed with great beauty and majesty.

There is no difficulty in seeing the appropriateness of the sword of gold, a gift of God which St. Philip used himself and has bequeathed to his

spiritual sons, wherewith to overthrow the adversaries of God's people.

St. Philip was pre-eminently a lover of his brethren, and among them he numbered every creature of God, but especially those of His creation, who by His bounty and goodness were made after His own image and likeness; all mankind redeemed by the precious Blood of Jesus Christ. He loved them because they were God's most God-like creation, and were destined by Him for an eternity of blessed possession of Himself. His love of God was too perfect, and his consciousness of God's love for them too intimate not to compel him to love them with all the ardour of his great soul. If God had so loved them as to give His only begotten Son to ignominy and shame and death for them; if that divine Son had laid aside His splendour and His glory to become incarnate and dwell amongst them, sharing their sorrows and labouring for their salvation; surely Philip who loved them too, must give his labour and his life and devote every faculty of his soul and body to this same end. Here at once is the whole secret of Philip's life, his love of God, and his love of God's creatures for God's sake. This love found

its expression in what without irreverence may be called St. Philip's spiritual ingenuity for capturing souls. It was rarely that he adopted the frontal attack, he got to the depths of men's natures, in which generally speaking, there is an abundance of good, and he made long détours to surround the citadel of his heart. He invested it with such compelling strength of sweetness, that hearts surrendered almost before they knew that siege was being laid to them. In Rome as elsewhere, in the sixteenth century man by his nature was seeking happiness. Philip's aim was to use this irresistible impulse and direct it to man's eternal salvation. He is the Saint of cheerful spirituality; he would have man serve God in joy, because he would have him turn to God's glory and his own salvation that natural desire for happiness which God has placed in him. This can be effected only by man seeking happiness in accordance with that gift of nature, which distinguishes him in the order of God's creation; if he seeks it outside of this, or without maintaining the due order and proportion sanctioned by this, he must of necessity miss his mark.

Reason must govern all man's seeking of happi-

ness, and reason forbids the means being used as if they were the end. If you ask why we are forced to witness so many failures in men's lives, notwithstanding they are ever seeking happiness and have so much at their disposal which could conduce to it, I answer, because they exclude God, the only source of true happiness, and seek in the means, that which is only to be found in the end. A life of real happiness here can only be such as leads on to the life which is eternal, and no man can have a true and certain hope of life everlasting, in which alone true happiness consists, unless he seeks to know the true life, which is Jesus Christ, and orders all things else to the attaining of that knowledge.

There are now, as there were in St. Philip's day and that of St. Augustine, "philosophers who have treated many questions of right and wrong, who have been the authors of many distinctions and definitions, who have completed many exceedingly clever arguments, who have filled many books and have proclaimed their own wisdom with braying trumpets." These have dared to say to men: "Follow us, embrace our school of thought, and you will find therein the secret of a happy life;"

yet their followers have found not happiness but disappointment, not possession but want, not preservation but destruction, not life but death. Religion has been left out of the reckoning. Religion is feared by many because they are afraid that it will spoil the happiness of life, whereas in truth, the very moderation and right proportioning which religion demands, secures for man great possibilities of happiness here, and the moral certainty of eternal happiness hereafter. The *gaudium magnum* of man is attainable only by the reasonable conformity of mind and heart with God. Religion at once gives to all, the means of happiness which are within the reach of man, and are in themselves perfectly suitable to his attaining it, in their proper place and in their due proportion. Yet the idea has seized upon his mind that religion is an obstacle to happiness, that it debars him from its pursuit, and that its effect is to produce dullness and dissatisfaction. He looks upon religion as excluding the sunshine from life, as the bitterness thrown into the waters of our present existence, removing all their sweetness. He sees in the restraint and self-control which religion enjoins the very bondage of misery. Many have

subscribed to the estimate placed by Byron upon the religious penance which Hilarion the hermit imposed upon himself, in the mountains of Arabida, who, the poet says,

> "Strove to merit heaven by making earth a hell,"

and so have avoided religion as they would a hermit's penitential cave. The condemnation of their madness is seen in the lives of God's Saints, and in none perhaps more plainly than in that of Philip Neri, the Saint of cheerfulness and happiness, sought and found only in religion.

His wisdom discovered to him the proportion of things. There are joys in life and happiness in all things, if religion is the standard and the guiding principle—

> "To use the things of earth
> So balanced in their worth
> That they lead on to heaven,"

is the wisdom of right reason and the only assurance of happiness which is worth the name, for it is real, it is lasting, it is eternal.

Because St. Philip was a lover of his brethren this is the happiness he sought for them. He might have been seen in the year 1538 when only twenty-three years old, coming forth into the

squares and public places of Rome to speak to all whom he might meet, of the things of God. "When shall we begin to do something good?" he would ask, for in this doing he knew was the beginning of happiness. His sweetness and gentleness overcame even the most obstinate, and by degrees he gathered round him many pupils in the school of happiness. He reached men's hearts by an exercise of cheerful charity. He brought the sunshine of happiness to the sick in the hospitals, and as he served their temporal wants, he spoke to them lovingly of the service of God. He was a ministering angel of comfort to them, bringing them joy in the midst of sorrow. Soon he finds himself surrounded by some fifteen companions, drawn by the magnet of his cheerful, loving character to serve with him the multitude of pilgrims who came to visit the Holy City, and the convalescents from the hospitals. These his first companions, were poor in all but virtue: in that they were abundantly rich, and happiness was their continued portion. When after eighteen years' residence in Rome, Philip was ordained priest in obedience to his confessor, a new field was opened out before him, in which he could labour on the

soil of men's souls. The harvest was almost miraculous. As minister of the sacrament of mercy he brought comfort and courage to the souls of untold multitudes who flocked to him. Day and night was this service most joyfully given, and nothing was considered by him to take precedence of it in importance; for a good conscience is a constant feast of happiness. Soon there began those wonderful spiritual conferences which were so marked a feature of the Saint's life. Gathered round him at first in his own little room, his children listened to the words of wisdom which fell from his lips, and presently were almost surprised to find themselves discoursing similarly at his request, finding spiritual joy in recounting the wonderful works of God and of His Saints. God blessed his work abundantly. He did not, however, leave it without that particular sign of approbation, opposition and persecution, yet even these were not able to disturb the calm serenity of his happiness founded in God and in the acceptance of His blessed will.

Surmounting all with confidence and with that happy optimism which was always his, he founded his Congregation of the Oratory in 1564, and

within a few years, many of the best and the noblest had associated themselves with Philip in his work, maintaining and spreading abroad that sweetness and happiness which is the characteristic of true religion.

So far nothing has been said of his wonderful humility, which was so profound; his self-renunciation, which was so complete; his many miracles, his marvellous love of God; nothing of his almsgiving, his disinterestedness, his raptures and his ecstasies; but what more need be said than that they were the outcome of the perfect union of his soul with God, and from that union came his apostolate of love and his character of happiness. In these two things is a summary of his life. He was a lover of the brethren here, and surely in heaven he prayeth much for the people and for the Holy City, the Church of God. His prayers have borne fruit not only in the fair land where he and his sons first laboured, but the sound of their word has gone over all the earth, and by his prayers and God's mercy, even these northern lands have been warmed by the fire of his charity and his zeal.

My brethren, the Prophet Jeremias stretched out

his hand and gave Judas Machabeus a sword of gold, saying: "Take this holy sword, a gift from God wherewith thou shalt overthrow the adversaries of my people Israel." St. Philip has left a sword of gold to his sons—the sword of prayer, the sword of loving zeal. He has given it to them, but not to them alone, for it may be wielded by all who love the brethren and who desire their greatest and only perfect happiness—eternal salvation. This is our privilege and our blessing, a gift of God which if we use it will bring us to the possession of His best and highest gift—Himself.

ST. CHARLES BORROMEO

A TRUE REFORMER

(St. Mary of the Angels, Bayswater)

One of our national poets has said, that "the proper study of mankind is man." And if correctly understood, this is true, for although the end of our being is that we may know God and possess Him, one of the means of our arriving at that knowledge is through His creatures. As the words of Wisdom say: "By the greatness of the beauty, and of the creature, the Creator of them may be seen, so as to be known thereby."

We shall not, however, proceed far in our study before we realise that man is a complex being. He is made up of two parts, the corporal and the spiritual, and although these two unite to form one complete whole, and although they are each the complement of the other, and bear a closer relationship to each other than any relationship in nature which is known to us, yet they are not always in accord. Indeed, since the fall of man, it may be

said that they are in a state of continual warfare, or at best there are only brief periods of peace, and those have their special dangers, even if they are not altogether perilous. Often indeed, man finds himself a strange contradiction, and one of the puzzles of life is supplied by the not infrequent presence of the highest qualities in the natural order, co-existing with the most shameful crimes in the moral order, in one and the same subject. If the study of mankind by man is pursued in an intelligent manner, the conclusion which is inevitable is, that of man we must expect the most extraordinary contradictions, and that we can have no true appreciation of him if we fix our eyes exclusively upon one side or the other. We must consider him, and we must judge him from a two-fold point of view. We shall be unfair to him if we consider him only from his human side, and we shall get but an imperfect knowledge of him if we confine ourselves to his spiritual side alone. What is true of man, is true also of every society composed of men. It must be so, for a whole of this kind must be of the same nature as its component parts.

We shall find it so even with the society or the

kingdom of Christ upon earth, which is called the Catholic Church. She is a divine institution, a divine society, a spiritual kingdom, but she has the human element in her composition, though she is not human in her object or in her end. Only in a secondary sense are her methods human, her real force is spiritual; her vitality springs from a divine life; the abundance of her riches is from a divine treasury; the efficient and directing cause of her continued existence is not of earth, but of heaven, not human, but divine. For all that, so far as she exists here below, she is a society or kingdom composed of men, and while on the one hand, we may look to her for all the excellencies attaching to a divine foundation, we should not be unprepared to find on the other hand, the weaknesses inseparable from all things partaking of the human. Not, be it understood, that the Church has in her essence any touch of human frailty such as must attach to a merely human institution. She has not in her the imperfections which must accompany every human work. In principle, in the means of sanctifying her members, she is perfect. There are no shortcomings, no defects in those things which are necessary for her to reach her end, for the

accomplishment of that work for which Christ established her. Independent of all human excellence or deficiencies, she is filled, as a wonderful armoury, with all those weapons which are necessary for the Christian's fight against his enemies. She is richly stored with all those divine aids which can elevate and transform human powers, and make them, as it were, divine. But for all that, men are the subjects of this divine kingdom, they are the human element in a complex society, and as we see contradictions in the complex individual, so may we see them in the kingdom of Christ. There are in the same society instances of the highest heroism in sanctity, co-existent—not in the same individual, but in the same society—with the greatest defections from moral rectitude. The contrast is not at all times equally remarkable. Sometimes that which is higher and holier asserts its predominance, and the world wonders at deeds and lives which would seem to us beyond the human, did we not know that they are the deeds and lives of men. They soar above the natural. They seem to be, as indeed they are, touched by the divine; elevated and transformed beyond themselves. There have been periods of great sanctity in the Church,

when the spiritual and the divine became manifest to the world as the dominating power. Faith and the supernatural were seen to take possession of men's souls, as religion progressed and triumphed and seemed to have become the glory of the children of men. The ages of faith stood out in glorious relief against the ages of infidelity, and the promised glory of the kingdom of Christ seemed to have begun upon the earth. But, alas! there have also been periods when the human side was more in evidence, now in one country, now in another—periods sometimes of defection from Christian practice, sometimes of defection from Christian faith.

Self-seeking has sometimes led to forgetfulness of God, to the scandal of the Church, to the peril, and, perhaps, to the perishing of immortal souls. Intellectual pride has shaken the foundations of an edifice which must rest upon humility; worldliness has dazzled eyes which have wandered from the figure of the crucified Master; corruption has eaten into hearts which centred themselves on things perishable. Sometimes the wolf got into the fold in sheep's clothing, when he who should have been a shepherd to the flock had become a hireling. At times another Judas was found, who for things base

would betray his Lord, and his Lord's interests. Again in some places, the world has seemed to lay hold on the children of the spiritual kingdom, and, alluring them with the cry of liberty and freedom, has betrayed them into licence, and bound them with the slavery of vice. But who could consistently say, that because of these temporary and local defections from the high standard of Christian faith and practice, the Church established by Christ has ceased to be His, or has ceased to possess His divine guidance? It would be as reasonable to say that man had ceased to be a rational creature, because a certain proportion of men are demented; or because there are transgressors of the law, therefore the law has ceased to be supreme. But did not Christ forewarn us of the presence in His Kingdom on earth, of the good and of the bad? Shall we go and root up the tares from the wheat! No! "suffer both to grow until the harvest, and then gather the wheat into My barns, but the tares tie up in bundles to burn." "It needs be that scandals come." So He has told us, and the woes uttered against those by whom they shall come, does not prevent them, perhaps does not even diminish them.

There is, however, a wonderful system of

compensation in the order of divine Providence. Just as, under the old law, God raised up deliverance for His people in the day of their greatest distress, just as He sent prophets to call them from their sinful ways, so under the new law, in times of great defections He raises up leaders and deliverers for His people. Such a leader, such a deliverer, was St. Charles Borromeo. He appeared at a time when the human element in the Church was strongly asserting itself, and the spiritual element was hidden. A general laxity of morals seemed to have fallen on the people, and even to have found its way into the sanctuary. Temporal governors were disposed to lord it over the Church, to deprive her of her privileges, and to claim exemptions from her laws, while they appropriated her revenues. The secular spirit, in opposition to the spirit of the Church, laid hold of prelates and princes and people; in fact, it may with truth be said that the sixteenth century witnessed a great and widely-spread decadence in morals and in faith. Then there appeared that most successful, as it is the most blighting of all heresies, Protestantism. Its very essence was a revolt against authority; every one should be a law to himself, and obedience and

submission were cast to the winds. Whole provinces were wrenched from obedience to the Church, the vineyard of the Lord was being desolated. Ah! truly, if the Church had been only a human institution, she would have collapsed under the combined calamities which had fallen upon her. But she was something more. Though in the world, she was not of it; and she manifested, even at this, one of her darkest periods, her divine origin. Her ever-abiding youthfulness, her amazing power of vitality, her wisdom, her apostolic zeal, her wealth of sanctity, were all magnificently displayed in Charles Borromeo, even before he reached his diocese of Milan. He was a personification of the Church. When he found himself in the midst of the people whom God had given as his special charge, the magnificent qualities of his great soul began to show themselves in his works. At the root of them all was a passionate devotion to the Church, which he loved with a humility and a strength which are only begotten of great sanctity. He saw and deplored and strove with all his soul to reform the abuses which had crept into the Church, and his methods of reform were consistent. He looked to his own home first. He

showed forth in himself and in his household, those virtues which he desired should flourish in his diocese. For well-nigh eighty years no archbishop had resided permanently among his people at Milan, but now their archbishop takes up his residence, and with a saintly household becomes an object of edification to the clergy and the bishops. Personal mortifications, incessant labours, genuine sacrifices, ardent prayer, these were the weapons of his warfare. How he used them and how successful they were, is now part of the history of the Church, and the glory of the city of Milan.

Where shall we find in the Saint's life that which we can hope to imitate? Such lives become almost our despair, and tempt us to fall back upon admiration, seeing that we shall fail in imitation.

There is, however, one characteristic of the Saint whose imitation is within the reach of all. It was singularly prominent in him, and pre-eminently necessary in his day. Perhaps it is even more so now. In all his works, whether with regard to himself, to his diocese, or to others outside, he seemed to be guided by a desire to think and to act in accordance with the spirit of the Church. Self was lost sight of, personal predilections were

stifled, convenience was disregarded; the one question was: "What is in the mind of the Church, what is her spirit?" This was the question of a great man and a great Saint, this the disposition of a true reformer. There was one standard for him, the standard which Jesus Christ Himself erected, that was the Church. She was to him the living voice of God, and his aim was to attune his mind into perfect accord with hers. This is a necessity of the present day. There is not wanting evidence of the spirit of criticism of the Church and of her methods, which is distinctly the modern spirit of the world. This is the age of progress we are told, and really the Church lags somewhat behind. Well, she can afford to be slow. She has two thousand years behind her, and all time in front of her. She need not hurry. She is not, as some institutions, of mushroom growth, which must, perforce, do things quickly, for they have not long to last. They must be in accord with the world, because they belong to the world, and depend upon it. They must give what the world demands, for the world is their master. The world says: "Here are scientific conclusions which clash with your professed faith. Why not hasten to

accommodate your faith with these modern discoveries, lest you be left behind?" But she who has the truth of God, stands firm and unmoved. No true discoveries of science can be opposed to her, because if they are true, they come from the same source whence come the truths of faith, from God. Then, again, the scientific conclusions of to-day may be falsified by the scientific conclusions of a hundred years hence, as the conclusions of a hundred years ago are falsified by those of to-day. He who feels with the Church, is content to wait, and does not disturb himself about the supposed discoveries of opposition between faith and science. But then the government of the Church must be brought up to date. She is quite behind the times, she should be polished up with the lustre of modern ideas! These are sentiments which have not been slow to find expression, even in the public press of to-day. It would seem to the simple-minded, that the methods best suited for her government should be known to those who are responsible for such government to God alone, and not to man; and he who has the mark of true Catholicity, he who has his mind in true accord with the spirit of the Church, is content with dutiful obedience to

his lawful superiors, and does not seek to prescribe the method of governing to those whose office is to govern. We shall be quite safe, we shall be prudently zealous, we shall be truly loyal, so long as we feel in all things with the Church, and are jealous of her prerogatives. Human wisdom is often folly, human prudence often treacherous. The Saints were wise with the wisdom of God, and wisdom conducted them through the right ways, and showed them the kingdom of God, and made them honourable in their labours, and accomplished their works . . . and gave them everlasting glory.

Let us not strive to be more wise than it behoveth to be wise. Wisdom is from above, and they are truly wise who give ear only to that wisdom which in its origin is divine.

THE ENGLISH MARTYRS

(English Martyrs, Tower Hill, Guild of Our Lady of Ransom)

"*I saw under the altar, the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice, saying: How long, O Lord, dost Thou not judge and revenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?*"—APOCALYPSE vi. 9, 10.

ALMOST every doctrine of our holy faith has been written in the blood of the Church's martyrs. Almost every virtue has been sealed with the life's blood of her children, who esteemed it a joy that they were accounted worthy to suffer for the name of Christ, and in defence of the virtues He came to teach.

The holy state of virginity; the inviolability of the seal of confession; the real presence; the sacred office of the apostleship,—these have all had their martyrs. Every stage and state of life, every age and every country, have given their martyrs to swell the ranks of that army of white-robed palm-bearing victors who stand before the throne of God.

To our country, however, if not exclusively, at

least pre-eminently, has been given the glory to claim as its own a multitude of martyrs who laid down their lives in defence of the prerogatives of Christ's Vicar upon earth. A spirit of intense devotion towards the See of Peter and towards the successor in his Chair, once pervaded the whole of this land. It was part of the national life of the people, and English princes and kings were among those whose joy and privilege it was to lay before the feet of the Father of Christendom the homage of their service, and the loving and loyal obedience of their own hearts and of those of their people. It was a holy instinct born of the teachings of the Roman missioners who first brought them the faith, which made the English nation look to Rome as the centre of all spiritual power and jurisdiction upon earth. The Roman Church was the mother and mistress of all the Churches, and as such she was looked up to lovingly and reverenced profoundly and heard obediently throughout the length and breadth of the land. If, occasionally, on certain matters of a temporal character, some strong-headed prince made revolt, it served but to bind more strongly still the bonds of devotion and obedience of the people, when final submission made the

power and dignity of the Roman Pontiff stand out more conspicuously before the world.

Through causes which we lovers of our country would fain see blotted out from the page of her history, the darkest night of England's sorrow came. The pestilential breath of heresy swept over the country, and a people who were born in the very atmosphere of loyalty and devotion to the See of Peter, and of obedience to the living voice of his successor, were called upon to renounce their devotion, and to transfer their obedience from the God-appointed Vicar of Christ, to an earthly-minded, self-constituted head, who should be not only the ruler of their bodies, but the ruler of their souls and the guide of their consciences. There was no lack of worldly wisdom in the method used to destroy the Faith which for a thousand years had held the heart of the people. It went to the fountain head at once, and endeavoured to poison the wells. If the living authorised teaching voice could be stilled in the land, if the guiding hand of the supreme Shepherd should be taken from the flock, if the bishops and the priests, depending for their orders and jurisdiction upon the chief of all bishops and priests, could be cut off from the centre of all power

and jurisdiction, how should the message of God reach His people; how should the flock know the true pastures; how should the sacraments, the living channels of God's grace to His children, reach their souls? It was a mighty blow, intended at one stroke to destroy the first principle and foundation of Christianity, the principle of submission to authority divinely constituted.

A revolt so fundamental had been disastrous to any country. It was the more disastrous in England because of the intensity of her devotion to the See of Rome. It shocked, it stunned, it paralysed the people. It shook the country to the very foundations of its faith, and as this new monster of revolt stalked the land, many a victim fell before its onslaught. From the nation was wrested, with sacrilegious violence, the brightest jewel of her crown, her allegiance to the living Apostle, and from the hearts of a tyrannised and a terrorised people, by blood-stained impious hands, was plucked their dearest treasure, their unity in faith with the mystic Body of Christ.

But if many fell, many also stood firm in the conflict. A cardinal of Holy Church, a lord chancellor of England, a host of priests, an army of

monks and friars, and among the laity, true men and devoted women in high station and in low, were found, who deemed it a glory that they were accounted worthy to suffer for the name of Christ, and for the prerogatives of Christ's Vicar on earth.

The hallowed spot where we are assembled, the Tower and triumphant Tyburn, speak to us of that white-robed army slain for the truth of God and for the testimony which they held. The hurdle and the gallows, the rack and the block became the thrones of their triumph for truth, whence their voices, long since stilled, reach our hearts, and tell us of the old faith of this land, which was living and divine because it came from the source of life, from God, the eternal Truth. They realised in all its fulness that where Peter was, there was the Church, and that if Peter in the person of his successor, the Roman Pontiff, was not heard and obeyed, there might be majestic material buildings, there might be so-called priests, attired with most scrupulous regard to ecclesiastical propriety, robe and rite and ritual might be there, but not the Church of God. The testimony which they had received from their forefathers was, that the one, true, catholic apostolic Church, founded by Jesus

Christ, was the Church which was in union with, and in subjection of obedience to, the Roman Pontiff. To him, in the person of Blessed Peter, had been given the keys of the kingdom of heaven; to him belonged the primacy in position, in power, and in jurisdiction; he alone had received the command to feed both the lambs and the sheep. In defence of these truths, thousands were ready to lay down their lives. Those who gave that testimony of love, devotion, and loyalty (than which no man may give greater), were no foreigners from some distant shore, who loved this country, only as the land of their adoption. They were the children of the soil. English blood ran in their veins, English speech was upon their lips, English love of home was in their hearts; England's name was to them as sweet music; England's honour and England's faith were worth the dying for. They were our brethren, our fellow countrymen, bound to us by ties that even death may not sever, and these ties are made even stronger, because they are sealed with their life's blood.

We have seen by faith, what St. John saw in vision. We have seen under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God; we

have known from the words of Christ that they, having lost their lives for Him and for His testimony, had found them; we felt that they must be in the presence of God, and our hope and our confidence was, that one day this should be declared by the voice of the Church. And blessed was the day and glorious in the annals of a glorious pontificate, that heard that declaration solemnly proclaimed. It sent a thrill of joy through the Church, and wherever a Catholic heart beat in the breast of an Englishman or Englishwoman in all the world, it beat the faster in gratitude to God that He had given them the grace to see that day. A new impulse was given to prayer for the conversion of England, when it was felt that prayers on earth were united with the prayers of a multitude standing before the throne, and in the sight of the Lamb, clothed with white robes and with palms in their hands. We seemed to hear them as they cried with a loud voice, saying: "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and revenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" We knew the nature of the judgment that they cried for, and we knew the manner of revenge they sought. It was for the judgment of

the mercy of the Lord, it was for the revenge of the Cross. It was that the days during which the countenance of God should be withheld from the land, might be shortened for the sake of His elect, that the day might dawn speedily when God's own truth should dispel the night of error and revolt. They cried for the sweet revenge of Christian charity, for blessings on the land which had made them a reproach, for choicest graces on the children of those who had reviled and persecuted them.

And who shall say that their prayers are not even now being answered? Look out over the land and you will see and hear a great awakening. There are signs, which thank God, are unmistakable. They point to a great revival in the knowledge of the Catholic faith, and in the desire to know its teaching. We are not the outlaws which our forefathers were. We may go abroad in the open day, and expect and receive, the reverence due to a great name. We have come forth from the catacombs. Our churches once more lift their heads in the land, and our non-Catholic fellow countrymen are beginning to acknowledge that the Catholic Church has a message to deliver, and that perhaps, that message

is worth considering. Once more may Mary's hymns be heard in our streets, and her banner be borne in our cities, and where there is a revival of devotion to the Blessed Mother of God, it is a sure sign of the revival of Catholic faith. But there are other signs also full of meaning for us. It has been truly said by those whose word is weighty, that there are signs in this country as in others, which indicate that the day is fast approaching when only two great parties on the question of religion will remain. On the one side, the indestructible Church of God, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman, who will see the end, as she saw the beginning, of all the sects; and on the other, the enemies of all religion, the upholders of godlessness, the absolute unbelievers. When that day shall come only God knows, but meanwhile we have a work to do, great and glorious and noble and enduring, if we are faithful. What that work is need scarcely be pointed out to you, members of the Guild of Our Lady of Ransom. You have taken upon you by the very fact of your enrolment, the duty of prayer, of work, and of sacrifice, to win back the souls of our fellow countrymen to God. Your prayers for the forgotten dead are a

sweet holocaust before the throne of God, they are an exercise of the highest charity, a sure harbinger of future blessing. This, however, is but part of your vocation, the silent hidden part, unknown to the world, and perhaps, without influence upon it. But there is your active work, the ransoming of souls from the slavery of error, the undoing of the chains of those who are held in a bondage, the more formidable as it is the less recognised. Here is your work, the extent of which is limited only by your courage and your zeal. The harvest is great and the labourers, though many, are comparatively few. Therefore must each be well equipped, each must be strong in faith and in hope, but above all each must be strong in charity. Your hearts must be touched by something of that love which made our divine Master long to draw all men to Himself. You must be lifted up with desire. Your power is the power of love. Your weapons are the weapons of love. Your cause is the cause of love, and love shall bring you victory. Not all may become champions in discussion, in power of persuasive argument, but it is given to all who will, nay, it is commanded all, that their lives should be a great and eloquent testimony to the

truth of the faith which is in them. If you are faithful to your daily prayer, if you are true to the Guild and to its interests, then through God's mercy, through the intercession of the immaculate Mother, through the prayers of St. Joseph, of Blessed Peter, and of our own dear martyrs of England, the day shall dawn which shall see this country once again united to God's Church, once again conspicuous among the nations of the earth for her devotion to the See of Peter, giving the majesty of her great name and the might of her prowess for the greater glory of God, and for the salvation of her children. And in that day, whether we see it with our mortal vision, or look down upon it from our home in heaven, our hearts shall throb with joy and exultation, and words will rise to our lips like unto those of the prophet: "Lift up thine eyes," O holy Church of God, "lift up thine eyes round about and see: all these are gathered together, they are come to thee, thy sons have come from afar, and thy daughters have risen up at thy side. Now hast thou seen and abounded, and thy heart has widened and been enlarged for the multitude of the sea has been converted to thee, the strength of the Gentiles has come to thee."

OUR LEPER BRETHREN

AN APPEAL ON BEHALF OF THE ST. FRANCIS LEPER GUILD

(St. Mary of the Angels, Bayswater)

THERE are certain circumstances which usually come to the aid of one whose duty it is to ask the alms of the faithful in charity, of which this morning I find myself deprived. It is true that the supernatural motives of Catholic charity are always powerful, and that no appeal reaches a Catholic heart, having knowledge that what we do for our Lord's least brethren we do for Him, without calling up a spirit of generosity and of sacrifice corresponding to our faith and our love of Him. But, for all that, the aid of other methods may be invoked. The preacher may be able to quicken the pulse of generosity, and to augment the flow of pity by the consideration of less lofty motives, drawn from his experiences and from those of his hearers.

The objects of our general charity we see round about us; the poor we have always with us. Their

pitiful lot is known to us, if not personally, at least from the work of such devoted followers of Christ as the Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul and the Sisters of Charity. The cry of the little children touches the human chords of our hearts. We read of the thousands of poor homeless creatures, who in the bleak cold of winter know no roof but the icy heavens; we see, perhaps, the sufferings of the poor in our great hospitals. If we have home and health and happiness, very gratitude for our lot moves us to pity and to help the shelterless, the disease-stricken, the unfortunate, and in these considerations the pleader has valuable auxiliaries, even when appealing for charity for the love of God.

It is more difficult to plead for those whose appallingly wretched lot few of us have ever witnessed, whose existence in the world we scarcely realise, except, perhaps, when they are recalled to mind by reading the holy Gospels, where we find them the special objects of our divine Lord's pity and healing power. When the existence of a St. Francis Leper Guild is made known to us, we learn what, perhaps, we never knew before, that there are existing in the world some two million poor lepers, who would be the object of His pity now,

if He still dwelt amongst us in physical and visible presence. And while the pleader is at this disadvantage, he finds no compensating knowledge in the possession of his hearers. It is possible, but it is exceedingly improbable, that some here present have seen a leper, though occasionally the awful disease has appeared in England, and Paris has a number of lepers. We cannot by imaginary contrast realise the blessing which is ours in the possession of clean health, free from the loathsome, practically incurable, plague of leprosy. Yet if we could, there would be no more powerful incentive from a human point of view, to urge us to help the lepers, if only as an act of thanksgiving. Certainly this motive would urge us, if we were witnesses, as we might be, in British Burma, India, China, Japan and Africa (not to speak of other parts of the world), of our fellow beings living a life of perpetual death, stricken under the inscrutable providence of God with this awful disease. Perhaps it would be true to say that the poor lepers are the most pitiable and the least cared for of all God's creatures. The most pitiable, because their disease renders personal service impossible except to the most heroic, because their

helplessness is extreme, because they suffer with no hope of recovery, because they die by inches, and they see their poor bodies corrupting and falling to pieces while they live. In an official report prepared for an European Government, the poor lepers were described as limping on various supports towards their visitors, their faces and limbs distorted by the awful ravages of the disease, their eyes full of that unmistakable expression of utter hopelessness which characterises the leper, their poor fingerless hands stretched out for relief. Cast off from their fellow creatures, avoided, dreaded, they were huddled together in huts where light scarcely entered, with neither bed, nor linen, nor water, nor light, while the air was infected with the odour of their disease. "I could not give a full description," the report goes on to say, "because I could not go right in on account of the fearful stench, similar to that which comes from a dead body, and moreover, the hut was swarming with vermin."

In such a place the lepers eat, cook, sleep, live and die, and when one poor creature is mercifully released by death, the body awaits the strength of the survivors to bear it out to burial. The

grave must be only a few yards from the door of the hut, for the power of the living can bear the dead no further. Does it not almost overtax our belief? Imagination can scarcely reach it. One great, heroic woman, who laboured for the poor lepers, has left on record that in one of those huts she saw twelve human beings, men, women and children. The scanty clothing which they possessed was infected and verminous. One man was dying, two had lost their toes and half their feet, they had tied boards from their knees to the ground so that by this help they might drag themselves from one spot to another. One man had no fingers, yet the poor stump was raised to make the sign of the cross. Ah, surely the sign of the cross was there in abundant evidence, the sign of the cross which He had laid upon them, Who for their salvation and for ours became as a leper and no man. There seems to be a spiritual mystery about leprosy which we cannot penetrate. It is the climax of the prophet's vision of the Man of Sorrows who came to redeem us. "There is no beauty in Him nor comeliness, and we have seen Him, and there was no sightliness . . . despised and the most abject of men, a Man of Sorrows

and acquainted with infirmities . . . and we have thought Him as it were a leper and as one stricken by God and afflicted."

Perhaps it was this, I had almost said sacramental, character of leprosy which moved a member of the Franciscan Order, the founder of which had a special tenderness for poor lepers, to institute the St. Francis Leper Guild, with the object of providing some alleviation for them in their unspeakably sad circumstances. For many years heroic men and women have sacrificed their lives to these sufferers, and the world was thrilled by the voluntary martyrdom of the apostle of the lepers, Father Damien. His life with the lepers and his death among them, stricken by the awful disease himself, riveted the eyes of the world upon the leper settlement of Molokai, and moved many to give their substance, and better still their personal service, to these poor outcast creatures of God. But how could the efforts of individuals however heroic, compass the necessities of so vast a work? Catholic missionaries, devoted priests and nuns from various parts of the world have gone forth to serve the lepers, and wherever their presence is, there too, are the angels of devotion and sacrifice; with the

alms of the faithful throughout the world they have been enabled in some degree to alleviate the sufferings of the poor stricken ones. It would be strange indeed if in England, at least in Catholic England, there was no effort to assist in so Christ-like a work. England had its lepers once, and they were the care of the Church and the objects of the loving charity of its saints and its people. England has her lepers still, and though by God's blessed bounty and providence they no longer dwell on these shores, their needs dwell in our hearts, and shall be helped by our charity; and when we know that the only means by which we can help them is through St. Francis's Leper Guild, for this is the only Catholic organisation for the purpose in this country, we will help them to the last point of our possibility.

Look out across the seas to far-off India, Japan, Abyssinia, China and the leper settlement of Molokai, and see the devoted priests of the Franciscan Order giving their lives for the poor lepers of Christ. They are physicians to soul and body, ministering to the corporal necessities of their leper children in the pestilential huts which, when necessary, they share with them, lifting up their hopes

from this world of despair to the heaven above, where alone for them there is hope, where alone for them is peace and cessation from suffering. See them breaking the Bread of Life for those whose lot is a living death, comforting them with the knowledge that, though He sorely tries them, God loves them still, and does not hesitate to give them His own blessed Body and Blood to be their sustaining food till the day of their deliverance. The time comes too often for these heroic priests, when the hand that ministered and sacrificed is itself stricken, and the word is whispered from hut to hut: "Our father has become one of us, he too, is a leper." Poor Father Damien in his sermons never addressed his children as "Brethren," he always said, "We lepers." But what shall we say of those valiant women the Franciscan Sisters, who give their lives to this work? If ever women ministered to the Body of the Lord Jesus, surely these holy virgins do. Their sacrifice must appeal to the hearts of Catholics, for it has touched even the Mohammedans. Whole tribes of lepers in Abyssinia, moved by the generous sacrifice of these gentle handmaidens of the Lord, have sought the consolation of that religion which alone could

inspire it, and have embraced the Catholic faith. Surely if there be a charity which needs no urging, it is this charity for the poor leper. We may thank God that the lower motives which might move our charity are all but absent from us on this occasion. Thank God that that which might appear to be a drawback in our appeal for charity, is in reality a help; it elevates, it transforms, it transfigures it beyond all doubt, and makes it an act of pure love of God. We will take up the poor leper in our arms this morning and lay him upon the altar of sacrifice; our poor victim is Christ Jesus. Our help is given to Him; let it be such that on the last great day He may recognise us as His benefactors, and crown us with the words: "I was a leper and you cleansed Me."

PEACE AND WAR

(*St. Michael's, Chatham*)

"*If armies in camp should stand together against me, my heart shall not fear, if a battle should rise up against me, in this will I be confident.*"—PSALM xxvi. 3.

IN the prophecies of the Old Testament which refer to the future Messiah, we find one thing especially predicted of Him, namely, that He was to be the Messenger of Peace. The prophet Isaiah says of Him, that His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God the mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace. And Michæus tells us that, "this Man shall be our peace," and holy David, speaking in the person of the Messiah, says, "With them that loved peace I was peaceful."

The very time of His coming was to be marked by a universal peace. And, as if from the beginning to fulfil the prophecies and to emphasise the change from strife "Peace on earth to men of good will," was part of the tidings of great joy

sung by the angels at His birth. How frequently during His life the blessing of peace fell from His lips upon His disciples, you need not that I remind you. "Peace be to you," "Go in peace," were His ordinary words of salutation and farewell. And when at last He would give them a parting gift beyond all price or purchase, it is His peace He gives them: "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you, not as the world giveth do I give unto you." From all this we might naturally conclude that the reign of peace had begun, and that peace was to be the lot of all the followers of Christ, the Prince of Peace. And yet we are confronted with the apparent contradiction that, according to the Holy Scriptures, man's life on earth is a warfare, that there are powers constantly warring against us, that we are under the necessity of continual fighting, that spiritual helmet and breast-plate must be on us ever, and that in our right hand we must carry the sword, which may not be sheathed until the battle is over.

Even if Holy Scripture gave no indication of this, our own experience would convince us that our life is one of continual strife and struggle. To watch, pray, and fight is the summary of a Christian life,

and if this seems to us incompatible with peace, it is because we have failed to realise that there are two parties, of which, if we are at peace with one, we are at war with the other, and if we are at war with one, we are at peace with the other.

God and sin stand opposed to each other in irreconcilable opposition. We are at peace with God if we are at war with sin. So the life of a Christian, to be a life of true peace, must be a life of real war, of war so fierce, so bitter, so unrelenting, of so long duration, that nothing in the history of wars of nations can be compared with it. There is no standing aloof, there are no non-combatants, all must declare for one side or the other; all are enrolled under one of two banners, fighting under the standard of God against sin, or fighting under the standard of Satan against God. Every one is known as enemy or friend by each of the two leaders. Thank God, brethren, there is no question as to the side upon which we are arrayed. Your very presence in the House of God is an assurance that you are on the right side, that you are followers of the great Leader, Whose standard is the Cross, which is, to all who fight under it, the signal of victory.

Perhaps however, our loyalty may be growing cold, or we may be running the risk of falling into the error of over-confidence. We shall do well then to consider the enemies' forces and to review our own, that so from a fair estimate of one and of the other, we may bear ourselves more fitting in the fight.

The forces against us are tremendous. They are led by skilled generals. They are proficient in all the manœuvres which go to make a successful attack. Never are they wearied, never are their resources exhausted, never do they lie down upon their arms, and give us a moment of secure rest. Their watch is continual, their patience without limit, their endurance unfailing, they will fight to the death; only when the victory is declared, for us or for them, will they give up all hope. Then again they are encouraged by the thought of their almost innumerable successes. The devil, the world and the flesh, blind error and fatal indifference, can claim their millions of vanquished ones. They claim them by thousands daily; their defeats are few, their victories many. Would it not make the stoutest heart quail to think of it! Nay; may we not ourselves have been tempted to

give up the struggle, to throw down our arms, to abandon in despair the hope of success, or, even to pass over to the enemy. Ah brethren, if we do this we are lost. True, that we are fighting a powerful, a determined enemy, but we are fighting in a cause that must triumph, for our cause is God's, and who is like unto God? And He Whose cause we fight has placed in our hands worthy weapons wherewith to combat our foes. There are the holy Sacraments, there is prayer, there is the help we receive from the communion of saints, from our share in the Holy Mass; to sum up all in one word, God is with us. "Hear, O Israel! you join in battle this day with your enemies, let not your heart be dismayed, be not afraid, do not give back, fear ye them not, for the Lord your God is in the midst of you, and will fight with you against your enemies and deliver you from danger." If these words sent on the Children of Israel with never a doubt, when they were fighting for their temporal lives and freedom and happiness, what do they mean for us in our fight for the freedom of our souls and those of others from the bondage of sin, for our eternal life of happiness with God! Here is our power, God is with

us, and who shall withstand the living God? If armies in camp should stand together against us, our hearts need not fear, if a battle should rise up against us, in this should we be confident, for the Lord our God is in our midst, and with His strength we are made strong.

One would think that under these circumstances there would be no coward souls, that as the fight is for all, all would fight. Alas! there are coward souls, craven souls, who refuse the fight, who surrender to the devil. Such a soul perhaps, once fought bravely for God, fought by the aid of prayer and mortification, overcame the enemy in many a fierce encounter, but at last the struggle grew weary, the flag was lowered; the angels wept, the evil spirits rejoiced. Such a one is he who lives on in mortal sin. He, like all other cowards, flies. He flies from the confessional, from the priest, from prayer, from sermons and good advice, from his former companions in arms, from God Himself, and he who was once a valiant warrior in the army of the Lord, is content to remain a craven coward in the ranks of the archenemy of man.

There is the dread possibility that such may be our lot in the future. This very possibility of it

and its consequences are too dreadful to think of. What can we do to secure ourselves? Thanks to the unspeakable mercy and providence of God, there is one whom all men may invoke; one who knows the enemy well, and all his stratagems. One who has led the fight before, who leads it still, who will fight with us and for us, if we invoke his aid. Upon him the whole Church has always looked as the leader of God's forces, and upon him, you my brethren, are privileged to have a special claim. Under his name and patronage, and under that of our sweet Lady, you in this parish are placed. Need I speak his name which is resounding in your hearts to-day, the glorious champion of God's soldiers, the unvanquished hero of the hosts of heaven, Michael the warrior archangel! Never since the day when there was a great battle in heaven, when Michael and his angels fought with the dragon and his angels, and the dragon, who is called the devil, was cast out—never has Blessed Michael sheathed his sword. Defeated and dethroned in heaven, the rebellious spirits sought a victory over man, sought a throne in man's heart. Everywhere, and from the beginning, the angels become devils, have directed their attacks against

men, and fighting against them, as in heaven of old, are Michael and his angels. Brethren, have you really understood, have you fully understood all the glory of your lot? If it be an honour to a man to claim comradeship with the unconquered heroes of his country, who shall speak the honour which is ours, in that we are fighting side by side with the warriors of heaven? Where is the man with one spark of martial spirit within him, who will not rouse himself at the cry which he and his company gave forth when they rushed on to victory? Where is the soldier, who, at the name of his gallant chief, will not spring once more to arms, to be a sharer in the glories of a fresh-won field? Your leader, brethren! I need not further point him out, you know him by his dazzling splendour, you know him by his name, Michael, "Quis sicut Deus?"—"Who is like unto God?"—and well he knows you. You are clothed in the garments which make you followers of the King, you received them at your baptism; you are marked with the seal of a soldier of Christ, which you received in confirmation; the helmet of salvation is on your heads, the sword of faith is in your hands, your battle-cry rings forth with confidence,

"For God, our Lady, and Saint Michael!" With such a cause, such a leader, such a cry, victory for you is certain. You will overcome, and it shall be given to you to eat of the tree of life, in the paradise of your God; you will overcome and it shall be given to you to sit with God upon His throne. And if in the struggle memories of past failures should come upon you, take heart again. If you have known defeat before, it was because you have fought alone, or your trust in St. Michael and the angel at your side has been half-hearted. Take heart again. With St. Michael on your side, no matter how utter your defeat has been in times gone by, Michael's sword is with you now, trust it truly. Onward then, yet once again, onward in the strength of God, which will work in you abundantly, onward with Blessed Michael as your leader, and Mary, Our Lady of Victories, as your protectress. Keep close to Mary, close to Michael, and the God of battles shall place upon your head the victor's crown.

A HEROINE OF THE CRIMEA

(Words spoken at the Golden Jubilee of Mother Mary Stanislaus, at the Hospital of St. John and St. Elizabeth, St. John's Wood, Feb. 12, 1909)

"Who shall find a valiant woman? From afar and from the utmost coasts is the price of her. . . . She hath considered a field and bought it, with the fruit of her hands she has planted a vineyard.—PROVERBS xxxi.

IF Solomon's vision had been limited to his day and to his land, he had perhaps never given us an answer to the question: "Who shall find a valiant woman?" He lived surrounded by the iniquities of paganism, and he was king of a people who were God's it is true, but who often forgot their strong Helper and outraged the bounties of their Benefactor. He gave the answer, however, as he saw in prophetic vision the Morning Star rising out of the night of expectation, the second Eve, the woman, "our fallen nature's solitary boast," who should crush the head of the serpent; the most perfectly ideal, and really perfect, valiant woman.

And since that incomparably valiant woman restored the harmonies of God's creation by her instant submission to His will once understood, by her undivided love and perfect service; thousands and tens of thousands of women in humble imitation have maintained the song of perfect praise, in the state of holy religion. The valiant woman, thank God, is found in these days and in all lands; sometimes in the midst of a coward-making world, more often in the cloister, held by the heroine-making vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. To some it is given to prove their valour during length of years, to others by arduousness of labour; to few indeed is it given to excel in both, to the degree which has been reached by the venerable Sister Mary Stanislaus Joseph, for whom, and with whom, we are assembled this morning, thanking God for sixty years of religious life, filled even till to-day with works possible only to the valiant woman.

"She considered a field and bought it, and with the fruit of her hands she has planted a vineyard."

More than sixty years ago she considered the field. The world was wide; freedom, comfort and pleasure were before her. She might have chosen a field which would have cost her less, the field

chosen by the many. But the valiant woman must be great of ideas, and noble of thought. Nothing less than the illimitable field of labour for God could engage her thoughts or satisfy her desires. It meant toil, poverty, sacrifice of self, annihilation of will; it meant obscurity and obedience; the price of it was great, but she bought it. She bought it on August 21, 1846, sixty-three years ago, when she entered the Convent at Bermondsey, and she sealed the bargain on February 12, 1849, sixty years ago to-day, when she made her solemn profession of religion into the hands of Nicholas Wiseman, Bishop of the London district.

A valiant woman is bold and generous of heart, as well as great and noble in thought. She gave her all for the field she had considered, and though she could not know the full cost at the moment of purchase, she paid it with all the generosity of her great heart. How could she know that, after five short years, the retirement of her convent must be relinquished at the call of ecclesiastical authority and religious charity, and exchanged for the publicity of the battlefield and the military hospital? She knew something of it when the wish of the saintly Bishop Grant reached the convent, that some of the sisters should go

out to the Crimea, to nurse the victims of the ravages of war and pestilence, and as soon as she knew it, she was ready with the price which the greater field must cost. On October 15, 1854, the little Band of Mercy left Bermondsey and embarked for the Crimea. They arrived in time for the severest and fiercest engagement of the campaign. The battle of Inkerman was fought on November 5, when the Russians made a grand attack on the allied forces, chiefly on the British, on the plateau of Inkerman, a little village lying to the north of Sebastopol. It was fought under cover of a dark and drizzling mist, for a while in absolute darkness. Two thousand six hundred and twelve English, and seventeen hundred and sixty French soldiers fell, and it is said, twelve thousand Russians.

Though it wounds our national pride to remember that, according to general opinion, the whole campaign was a muddle (we were, as usual, unprepared for war), it at least helps us to estimate more truly the sacrifice which obedience demanded of the Sisters. British valour was not wanting, and our soldiers covered themselves with glory. But there were foes more formidable than the Russians; disease and pestilence were destroying more

soldiers than the guns of the enemy. The sufferings of the army can scarcely be imagined. Even those who were in health were unsuitably clad and were perishing with cold; provisions were insufficient, and a great deal of that which did arrive was in a state of decomposition, poisoning the troops and giving occasion for *Punch's* caustic remark, that "One man's preserved meat is another man's poison." If this was the condition of those who were in health and as yet unwounded, what must have been that of the cholera-stricken and the wounded? The hospitals at Scutari and at Balaklava, whither our sisters went, were in a wretchedly disorganised condition. There was no system, and supplies were scanty and unsuitable. Transports laden with provisions and winter clothing were destroyed by fearful storms in the Black Sea. Medical stores were left to decay at Varna; the holds of vessels in Balaklava Bay were filled with medicines and surgical appliances, and there they were left, while the wounded were waiting for them at Scutari. The medical officers were able and devoted men, worthy members of a noble profession, but they were unable to amputate destroyed limbs without instruments, or to heal wounds without dressings. Their devotion and their skill

could do little, while they were destitute of the commonest appliances of the hospital. Even if these had been available, there were no nurses to dress and to bandage and to nurse the sick. It was at this supreme moment in the history of humanity and of our country, that the Secretary for War, Mr. Sidney Herbert, whose name recalls the gracious lady still happily with us, the Lady Herbert of Lea his wife, secured the services of Miss Florence Nightingale and a band of skilled women to go out to the Crimea to serve the stricken soldiers. They had studied hospital reform, and had reduced nursing to a system and a science. Joined by the venerable Jubilarian of to-day and her companions in religion, they wrought a holy revolution in the kingdom of suffering and sickness, which must render their memory imperishable, so long as sacrifice for others is held to be a virtue.

The labours of the Crimea were followed by more peaceful, though, perhaps, no less arduous ones. On her return to England in 1856, Mother Stanislaus went with others of the Sisters to found the Convent and Hospital of St. John and St. Elizabeth, of which convent she was elected

superior in 1866, and remained in that office for fifteen years.

Her administration was marked by wisdom and thoroughness, and after so long a period of work she might well have rested from her labours. Another field however, demanded her presence, and in 1884 she went to the Orphanage at Walthamstow, which she had previously established as a branch house, and there she laboured for another six years. But Walthamstow must be left again for a while, and the convent and hospital in Great Ormond Street received her once more as superior. Here a period of seven years was passed, and then she returns to Walthamstow for eight years more. Only when the weight of four score and five years was upon her did she ask leave to retire from all office, to prepare herself quietly, as she expressed it, for her last end. How the good work which for so many years was done at Great Ormond Street was transferred here, is known to most of you. Her lofty mind, her bold and generous heart, her great and lasting influence with others, were largely responsible for that stupendous undertaking. The valiant woman was seen in it all. She considered the field and bought

it, and with the fruit of her hands she has planted a vineyard. The valiant woman inspired others with her spirit. She has proved her possession of the third quality of a valiant woman; a great mind and a generous heart have produced others like unto herself. She has gained the confidence and esteem of Catholics and non-Catholics alike; she has seen the hospital rise to the heights of modern requirements. She has planted a vineyard, of which the fruits will supply the spiritual and physical needs of thousands, long after the hand of the planter has ceased to work. And for all this, glory be to God! No one would be more ready than our venerable Sister to cry out, "Non nobis, Domine, non nobis"—"Not unto me, O Lord, not unto me, but to Thy name be glory!" Still while we bless God and thank Him for giving her the grace and power to be a valiant woman, we congratulate her upon her labours and upon their success, we beg God to bless her and to sweeten the remainder of her days with His abiding peace. "Give her of the fruits of her hands, O Lord, and let her works praise her in the gates."

FINIS

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION
BX1756.G7 C001
SERMONS AND LECTURES NEW YORK
3 0311 00043 7389

53628

BX
1756
.G76
S47
1910

WITHDRAWN

BX
1756
.G76 Grosch, H.J.
AUTHOR
S47 SERMONS AND ...
1910 TITLE
53628

25, 111

WHEN taking out this book, please write name and date on card and place card in CARD-DROP.

PLEASE see that this book is returned ON TIME: others may be waiting for it.

KINDLY refrain from defacing this book in any way, and also from leaving MARKERS of any kind between the pages.